American Academy of Religion
Board of Directors Meeting
Palmer House Hotel
Chicago, Illinois
Saturday April 20, 2012 (9:00AM-5:30PM)
Sunday April 21, 2012 (9:00AM-11:00AM)

Present: Donna Bowman, Elonda Clay, John Esposito, Jack Fitzmier, Warren Frisina, Janet Jakobsen, David Kim, Brian Pennington, Roberto Lint Sagarena, Nelly van Dorn, Laurie Zoloth

Staff: Steven Herrick

Regrets: Otto A. Maduro (note: present via speaker phone 4/20 11:00AM-12:30PM)

1. Welcome and Call to Order

In the absence of AAR President Otto Maduro, Jack Fitzmier thanked everyone for their presence and called the meeting to order at 9:00AM. For the sake of 4 new board members (Clay, Frisina, Sagarena, Zoloth) introductions were made all around.

2. Review of the Agenda

The agenda was adjusted in light of the invitation to the Unite Here representatives at 11:15AM.

3. Executive Reports

3.1 President’s Report

In President Madura’s absence there was no formal presidential report. President Elect John Esposito indicated he’d be playing a more active role than normal at this meeting to fill in for Otto; and he encouraged us all to keep our comments focused and brief as we have a full agenda.

3.2 Executive Director’s Report

Executive Director Jack Fitzmier reported on the following items.

a. American Lectures on the History of Religion. Lou Ruprecht and his committee have made good progress on the American Lectures on the History of Religion, a lecture series which had been moribund until recently. This series has a small endowment and a publishing partnership with Columbia University Press. The lectures will take place in a particular city beginning with Atlanta.
b. **Teagle Foundation Grants.** We have two grants still operational from the Teagle Foundation. The first is designed to spend down about $13,000 in leftover funds from an earlier project. It involves gathering and posting data about several different religion majors to serve as a resource for chairs looking to rethink their own programs. This project must be completed by June 30, 2012. The second project involves gathering and sharing data on what religion majors are doing after graduation. A pilot version is underway with information being collected from graduates of 5 institutions: Emory, Spellman, Stonehill, St. Olaf, Georgia State.

c. **Group to discuss Disability Issues.** We are bringing together a group to continue the conversations initiated by Member Advocate Janet Jakobsen at the 2011 Annual Meeting on concerns among disabled AAR members. The staff is gathering volunteers for this group which will meet.

d. **Related Scholarly Organizations.** The Buddhist-Christian Study Group has requested renewal of their status as a related scholarly organization. In addition, the International Association of Shin Buddhist Studies has made a request to be accepted as a related scholarly organization. (These requests were taken up by the board later in the meeting.)

e. **Departments Under Duress.** The situation at Northern Iowa University, where a department’s viability is being threatened by reduction in forces (through attrition and non-renewal of existing lines), calls to mind the need for a more robust response mechanism than we currently have in place. In the past the AAR has managed to influence and in some cases save departments from closure by systematically lobbying administrators at institutions considering the reduction or elimination of religion departments. Letters from the Executive Director, the Presidential Line and the Board have sometimes been deployed. Jack feels that letters from the Board and the Presidents are more effective than letters from the Executive Director alone.

*Discussion:* It was pointed out that the AAR is a body formed to support both intellectual and guild building goals. In light of this, we might consider entering into conversation with the American Association of University Professors, about ways to be supportive when departments are under duress. At a minimum, all seemed to agree we certainly should write such letters. David Kim and Laurie Zoloth volunteered to look at past letters and draft a response appropriate to the Northern Iowa situation.

*Action item:* David Kim and Laurie Zoloth will review past letters and draft a response appropriate to the Northern Iowa situation.

f. **Publisher’s Weekly Survey re: E-books.** Publishers’ Weekly has undertaken a partnership with SBL to produce a survey involving the changing role of e-
books in classrooms. Jack is inclined to allow PW to use the AAR membership list as well. Combined that would give them access to about 18,000 members, a large group that is likely to produce significant results. Results will come quickly as the firm producing the report recognizes that the situation is changing rapidly.

**g. Joint Board Meeting with SBL at AM.** Jack has been in conversation with John Kutsko executive director of SBL about the possibility of a joint AAR/SBL Board meeting in place of all or part of our regular all day board meeting at the Annual Meeting. This joint meeting would be facilitated by Pauline Yu, the President of ACLS. Is this a good idea?

*Discussion:* Unanimous consent. Jack will proceed to make arrangements.

**h. Mining Employment Data.** SBL has committed a staff person to the task of mining the employment data stemming from our employment center and comparing it to data in cognate fields like history and anthropology.

**i. Demographic information about AAR members.** Jack repeated his assertion that we don’t yet really “know” much about AAR members; we lack basic demographic information. This is a problem pointed to in the Mini-Summit Report (see discussion below from SWIP, CREM, LBGTIQ committees). SBL is making a gigantic move to get serious information about its members, we ought move in this direction too.

*Discussion:* While there was general consensus that such information is vital, it was also pointed out that the AAR should be careful to structure the gathering of such data within the framework of “informed consent.” In other words, we don’t want to inadvertently give the impression that giving such information is a condition of membership within the academy. It was also pointed out that the present policy of requesting information on race and sexual orientation at the point of membership should be discontinued until such time as we come up with a better strategy for gathering and making use of that data.

**j. SBL Grant to Foster Critical Study of Qur’an Group.** Jack reported that the SBL had received a grant from the Luce Foundation to foster the critical study of the Qur’an. The goal in three years is to form an independent society dedicated to such work. AAR is not directly involved in this, although there have been some security related concerns raised and discussed with Emory and law enforcement officials.

*Discussion:* There was some surprise and concern that such a project could emanate from an organization without an active group of Islamic Studies scholars. In fact, some Board Members, including Members who study Islam,
called this a serious error. Worries were expressed that the effort might be misperceived as an effort to make Qur’anic studies mirror in form and structure strategies deployed in studying Jewish and Christian scriptures. Jack’s impression was that the organizers of this effort had such concerns on their radar. Some noted that since this is solely an SBL project we have no direct role in its development. From this perspective our only direct interests stem from the fact that we share annual meeting and office space which might need to address security concerns should the group prove controversial. Some thought this something worth discussing further with SBL.

k. **Addendum to Memo of Intent re: Annual Meeting.** The AAR and SBL signed a memo of intent outlining the responsibilities and obligations to one another when we agreed undertake concurrent meetings for the foreseeable future. As we work together it has become clear that some aspects of the meeting need to be jointly owned again, e.g. the registration software and the employment services operation. Jack reported that he was moving ahead with the Executive Director of SBL to draft addenda to the original agreement.

l. **ACLS Responsibilities.** Jack reported that he had agreed to serve on the Executive Committee of the ACLS Board of Directors. As he explained, there are advantages to the AAR playing a leadership role in the premiere association of learned societies. It raises AAR’s visibility, and creates openings for partnerships with other organizations and learned societies. He also reported the possibility that he would be elected to Chair the executive committee. The chairmanship is as of yet just a possibility and Jack was apprising the board in anticipation of it coming up.

**Discussion:** While it was acknowledged that having the AAR’s executive director play a prominent role in ACLS is clearly to our advantage if we were then able to take intellectual and policy leadership of the disciplines, there was considerable concern about the timing and extent of the responsibilities associated with chairing the executive committee. Unfortunately, the ACLS meeting occurs the week before the Annual Meeting. Though some asked about the possibility of changing it, Jack informed us a change was not an option given that there are 71 other organizations with their own scheduling issues. Jack acknowledged that the timing wasn’t perfect, but also pointed out that he already attends the meeting, and would continue to do so even if he were not appointed chair. There was a question about the nature of the duties of leadership for the ACLS in the week prior to our meeting. There was also some sense that the previous AAR Executive Director had played a similar role in the ACLS at some point during her tenure. Jack indicated he would continue to explore the nature and time required for this role, and report back to the board before making a decision to accept the position should it be offered to him.
3.2 Technology Report – Steve Herrick, Chief Information Officer

Steve Herrick, AAR’s Chief Information Officer, reported on the status of several major technology projects that are currently underway. These projects are designed to update and replace an aging, homegrown patchwork database that is increasingly unstable.

Replacing Core Systems:

a. Annual Meeting Information System. This project is 80% complete and has an expected completion date of October 2012.

b. Employment Center Information System. This project is 20% complete and has an expected completion date of August 2012.

c. AAR’s Main Websites & Membership Database. This project is 75% complete and has an expected completion date of August 2012.

d. Installation of Upgraded Security Systems. AAR’s current login and password strategies are woefully out of date and subject to easy penetration. A new system will be introduced at a “low load” time of the year giving AAR members an opportunity acclimate to the new system without disrupting other pressing AAR business.

Fulfilling Grant Commitments:

a. The Teagle funded religion majors project is 80% complete and has an expected completion date of June, 2012.

b. The AAR is a sub-contractor for a Social Science Research Grant (in the amount of $10,000) to Emory University in a project promoting Islam Scholars as Media Sources. This project is 60% done and has a completion date of June, 2012.

Longer Term Projects:

a. Integrating RSN with the main AAR Webpages. As an economy measure RSN was moved from paper to electronic format a few years ago. This has led to duplication of information and dilution of the RSN and AAR brand. To overcome that a project is underway to subsume RSN materials within the main AAR webpage.

b. Biosphere. Biosphere is a social networking platform for academics based on open-source software. It is being developed as a component of a larger
course management software project by the Sakai Foundation based in open source software. Recent changes at Sakai have caused a delay in the implementation of Biosphere. However, NYU has specific needs for those aspects of the program that interest us, and is moving ahead with implementation of a version for their first year students as early as May. As this is open source software, they have promised to share their code with us, suggesting that significant progress could be made as early as this summer.

Discussion: Questions were raised about the purpose and goals of this project, given that during the last few years a variety of programs and on line scholarly communities that now exist. It was suggested that the AAR look into a product already in use mainly by scientists called Research Gate which seemed to have many of the same functionalities that we are pursuing via Biosphere. Steve said he’d investigate Research Gate and other products.

4.0 Audit Report

John Esposito reported from the finance committee that the Audit Report had come through clean and without any recommendations from the auditors.

Motion: To accept the auditor’s report. Seconded
The motion passed unanimously.

5.0 AAR’s Proposed 2012-13 Budget

In the absence of AAR Director of Finance and Administration Deborah Minor, AAR Treasurer Donna Bowman agreed to go over the AAR’s financial statements and proposed budget for 2012-13. Among the points highlighted were the observations that approximately 75% of AAR revenue comes from membership dues and the AM income. Thus, these two streams must be watched carefully. The recent addition of a membership coordinator to the staff was designed to allow increased attention to membership development efforts. Some unusual expenses in this budget cycle include: additional expenses associated with computers and software development (including the rolling out of the new Papers System for AM proposal submissions) and the added cost of running shuttle buses in Chicago.

Happily, the AAR’s proposed budget is in the black again. This is a significant turnaround from just a few years ago when the overall economic crisis hit revenues hard. Layoffs, cost containment moves, and a modest increase in membership numbers are what moved the AAR budget back into the black.

Jack added that membership is on track from last year, that we plan on spending down some grant funds, and that a previously approved capital expense for software development of $123,000 is off budget. He also added that uncertainties
surrounding this meeting might require the submission of an amended budget sometime after June 1 when we will “know a whole lot more” about our situation.

Discussion: There was concern that the imminent arrival of our guests would not permit full discussion of budget related questions at this time. So we agreed to suspend discussion till the afternoon.

Motion to approve the budget. Tabled till later in the meeting.

6.0 Unite Here Call for Boycott of Hyatt Facilities

6.1 Preliminary Board Discussion

Recently, the board was made aware of an ongoing labor dispute between Unite Here (a union for hotel workers) and the Hyatt Hotel chain. Unite Here has called for a boycott of all Hyatt facilities charging that Hyatt remains unwilling to sign a contract comparable to contracts signed by all of the other major Chicago hotels. The Hyatt disputes this claim. As the board had received a letter from the Hyatt outlining its position, it was decided to invite Unite Here representatives in order to secure a fuller understanding of the circumstances from their point of view. In anticipation of their impending visit the board discussed questions and information we hoped to attain.

Discussion: A general discussion ensued. Some specific questions were suggested for our conversation with the union:

a. What specific things are they asking of us? Are there other non-boycott related actions we might take that would be helpful to them?
b. What have they asked of other organizations?
c. What have others done?
d. How can they help us to help them?
e. Where are negotiations as of today? What are prospects for settling?
f. Have they approached public officials such as the mayor or Chicago labor council? Who are their coalition partners?

During the pre-meeting discussion several points were made:

a. It was pointed out that our meeting contracts are held jointly with SBL and that we need to take seriously our partnership with them as we formulate our responses.
b. Some Board Members argued that there is no way to avoid being an actor in this situation. Cancelling the contract (for example) would be an action, but so would allowing the situation to proceed without modification in light of the boycott call. Those who took this position argue that this situation paints a binary choice; either we are with the workers or we are with the hotel.
c. Some members, however, urged us to look for non-binary strategies that would allow us respond to requests by members who want to honor the boycott without putting the AAR at risk of defaulting on our contracts and having to pay hefty penalties. In reference to this point, others noted that the union was asking for support of the boycott, and not for a contract default.

d. Others pointed out that we have to have some conversation about how to assess competing claims and whether there is any neutral voice that could help us see things more clearly. Others disputed the idea of a “neutral voice” as an epistemic possibility.

e. Jack noted that the Executive Committee had prepared a series of possible responses for the board to take up after the conversation with Unite Here. These responses ran along a continuum from making no changes to cancelling the contract. The Executive Committee thought having those suggestions ready to hand would make it easier for the Board as a whole to have a focused and productive conversation.

6.2 Unite Here Presentation with Q&A

Unite Here representatives arrived at 11:15 AM to make a presentation to the Board. The individuals present included:

- Ross Hyman, AFL-CIO
- Sonia Ordonez, Cook, Hyatt, Chicago, termination in contention under grievance procedure
- Marek Rozpadek, Bell Staff, Hyatt, Chicago
- Jackie White, Housekeeping, Hyatt, Indianapolis
- Eva Sanchez, former Hospitality Staffing Solutions worker at Hyatt and other Indianapolis hotels
- Dr. Iva Carruthers, Samuel DeWitt Procter Conference, General Secretary
- Tiaunna Boyd, Chicago Theological Seminary Student, Samuel Dewitt Procter Conference, Director of Advocacy
- Carolyn Roncolato, Chicago Theological Seminary Ph.D. student, Member American Academy of Religion

Mr. Hyman opened the presentation with an extensive review of the conflict between Hyatt and the Unite Here members. He argued that among other abuses, Hyatt uses sub-contracting to undercut industry standard wage minimums and benefit packages. By firing workers en-mass (e.g. 2009, Boston), Hyatt is able to
bring in non-union labor at much lower wages and without health or other benefits. Moreover, these workers are prevented from organizing since their employer is not the hotel, but rather the sub-contracting corporation that hired them. At the same time, Hyatt has been increasing work load expectations (from 15 rooms/day to 30 rooms/day) for both its regular and sub-contracted labor. He emphasized that at this particular time, when so many of the statutes which used to support and promote union organizing have been eroded, the only way for workers to equal the playing field in their struggle with management is by enlisting community partners who are willing to stand with them. That is the reason for the boycott. A full on strike, while always an option, puts already vulnerable people even more at risk of immediate firing. The boycott strategy raises pressure on management while allowing workers to continue organizing and finding new ways to press their case.

We then heard from several workers each of whom detailed different ways in which they claimed the Hyatt corporation acted in bad faith with respect to its work force. The accusations included groundless firings of workers who were also union organizers, mandatory overtime demands designed to reduce the number of workers on staff, workload increases that have led to higher injury rates (higher at Hyatt than at other hotels), and calls to again reduce the number of workers. The consequences of these practices were described as devastating for hotel workers. Many reported losing their jobs and sinking into poverty, homelessness and malnutrition for themselves and (in some cases) their children. Several who had worked at Hyatt for years reported finding themselves suddenly fired after they became visibly active in the union effort.

Throughout their presentations, the workers emphasized that their only goal was for Hyatt to sign a contract comparable with that signed by other hotels in Chicago. They were resisting what they described as Hyatt’s desire to lower a hard-won standard. They were quite sure that if Hyatt’s contract were to have lower expectations for wages, benefits, and working conditions, all the other hotels in the area would move to make demands for similar concessions when their contracts come up again.

Next, Dr. Iva Carruthers, the General Secretary of the Samuel DeWitt Procter Conference, Inc. (SDPC), described the circumstances surrounding their organization’s last minute decision to honor the Unite Here boycott call and cancel plans to host their 9th annual meeting at the Hyatt McCormick in 2012. Given their mission, the SDPC Board of Trustees felt they had no choice, but to stand with the workers against the hotel. They took this decision even though the event was just 5 weeks away and the possible penalty for breaking the contract would be $150,000.

Ultimately, through negotiations with the hotel and their conference planner, they were able to relocate their event at the Drake Hotel. In addition, they avoided the penalty by agreeing to hold two subsequent meetings at the Hyatt in later years, so long as the Hyatt had signed a contract with Unite Here workers in the interim. We were also addressed by two AAR members who work with the union, one a recent graduate who works with the Procter Conference and another, a graduate student.
who called on our board directly to act on requests by members to honor the boycott. Appealing directly to us as scholarly leaders, she made the point that social ethics was integral to our academic work.

Discussion: AAR Board members thanked all for the presentation and indicated we are taking the situation they’ve describe quite seriously. They then asked several questions.

Question: Are Hyatt Hotels managed by Hyatt’s corporate headquarters or operated more like franchises? Why are some Hyatt’s being boycotted but not others?

Answer: All convention class Hyatt’s are managed directly by corporate. But the contracts are written hotel by hotel. So, some hotels have yet to go through the process of negotiating new contracts and hence have not yet been challenged by the union.

Question: We have a letter from Hyatt stating that the Union is trying to block secret ballots. What is the situation?

Answer: Their concern is not with the secret ballot. What they want is the required 6 month period between the scheduling of the election and its execution. During that time they are aware that they can fire or harass whomever they will with impunity. There is a history of employers doing this, of which the workers are well aware. Only a “card check,” which allows the workers to get union cards signed privately allows the workers to organize without direct threat of job loss.

Question: Hyatt says they offered to sign the city contract. Is that true?

Answer: They have not offered to sign a contract that is comparable to the ones signed by every other union hotel in Chicago (e.g. hotels run by Hilton and Starwood). Hyatt has agreed to the same wage rules, and to most of the same health benefits. But it refuses to concede to the same standards when it comes to sub-contracting rules. This is key because the sub-contracting strategy has been used to undermine standards at other hotels in other cities.

Question: Is there a neutral party, such as someone from the National Labor Relations Board mediating your dispute with Hyatt that we could talk to?

Answer: There is an NLRB representative who sits in on our sessions. But he has no substantive or mediating role so long as we keep talking to one another. The role of the NLRB is to force discourse when parties refuse to meet, not to take positions.

Question: In your ideal world what would you like us to do?
Answer 1: (from a worker) Stand by principle, be serious about moving your event out; move your part of the business out. Supporting the boycott is the only way we can achieve the same standard at Hyatt as at other hotels.

Answer 2: (from the Procter leadership) You are in a position to think about sequential processes, steps that can be taken between now and the final decision; it is not too soon to begin. . . think strategically about the interim steps in parallel with these workers; be very clear of the extent to which you are willing to pay the cost to be on the cross. We were able to negotiate the penalty away and we were affirmed by our constituents. We did the right thing. (God rewarded SDPC with a 5 star hotel!)

Answer 3: You have vertical and horizontal power in this struggle. There is the immediate impact of your event in 2012 in Chicago. Hyatt stands to lose a lot of money if you honor our boycott. But, with 9 years of contracts (many of which include Hyatt hotels) you also have horizontal power stretching into the future. Several years ago the previous AAR Executive Director subscribed to Innex (http://www.inmex.org/) a non-profit meeting planning organization that is supported by Unite Here and that promotes the use of unionized hotels. They can be of assistance in helping you to think through your options.

Lunch Break 12:45-2:00PM

Reconvene 2:15PM

6.3 Follow Up Hyatt Deliberations

The following is a summary of key points made during extended deliberation about the Hyatt Boycott Situation and the information/evidence gathered in the morning meeting.

There was consensus that the circumstances outlined by the representatives from Unite Here were both convincing and compelling. Everyone was convinced that the these workers were struggling to assert and make use of a basic human right to organize themselves into a guild with the aim of using their collective power to balance the power possessed by Hyatt management when it comes to negotiating a fair package of compensations and working conditions. Their presentation was also compelling in that virtually all board members indicated a willingness to take actions that would assist the workers in their struggle.

Some Board Members argued that the AAR is a guild that promotes and protects individual scholars and departments who are sometimes subject to arbitrary assertions of institutional power in addition to its clear role as a scholarly organization. These Members argued that the core issue of subcontracting was the same issue faced by our members as Universities increasingly rely on part time
faculty as a way to avoid hiring tenure track faculty. Thus, these members argued that the AAR mission brings us within the orbit of labor’s demands generally. Board Members who began with this assumption about our mission argued strongly that AAR members and the institution as a whole had a moral responsibility to side with the workers in this dispute. These Board Members were led to conclude that with respect to this dispute our primary focus ought to be on doing whatever the AAR can to make clear to Hyatt that the AAR will not do business with a hotel that fails to come to an agreement with a union on a contract. While not heedless that there are limits to what the AAR can sustain financially, this group urged that such considerations be subordinated wherever possible to a principled stand in support of workers. For them, this is a moral choice rooted in a binary decision to either stand with the workers or stand with the hotel owners. For these Board Members, an academic institution whose membership includes many with careers built upon the pursuit and promotion of social justice must act to promote those values even if such actions come at great cost.

Board members who support a call to honor the boycott also made other key points. First that the demand grows from a widespread call from our members, emerging not only in the nearly 800 letters we received by from personal verbal messages from our departments and other committees (including the Program committee). We are committed, the argument was made, to democratic and representative faculty governance on this and all other matters. Critical to this is full informed consent and a strong supporting position.

The other critical reason articulated was based in scholarly and epistemic concerns. The point was repeatedly made that there is “no view from nowhere” in matters of moral and policy concern, and perhaps in basic phenomenological premises. A position to honor the boycott or to refuse to honor it are both “positions” and these Board Members argued it is not defensible to call one political and one scholarly. Even if the AAR is seen as a learned society with NO guild duties (which would be counter to our own mission statement) many noted that honoring the boycott grows directly out of our scholarly commitments to fact based research, to hearing the voice of the vulnerable and marginal in texts and events, and to a concern for understanding the basic social contexts of social behaviors.

Other Board Members argued that the AAR’s mission, while clear in its commitment to supporting all dimensions of the academic study of religion, does not extend naturally into labor disputes and other political issues. These Board Members pointed out that AAR members are a heterogeneous group who paid dues to an institution with an announced mission to promote and protect the academic study of religion. Other causes (including labor disputes), while laudable on other grounds, simply fall outside of that orbit. Moreover, these Board Members argued that as we have no basis for presuming unanimity among AAR members on any issues other than those that involve the promotion and protection of the academic study of religion (e.g. academic freedom issues) we ought to move with extreme caution before committing the AAR to public positions, especially those that involve
significant costs to the Academy and its members. While acknowledging that there are indeed members who see their scholarly work through the lens of the active pursuit of a particular kind of social justice, these Board Members argued strongly that a significant percentage of our members either do not apply such a lens to their scholarly work or alternatively define social justice in a plurality of ways. Therefore, these Board Members argued that our responsibility to the total membership, in all of its heterogeneity, circumscribes that kind of actions we can responsibly take while still claiming to be acting on behalf of the whole membership. As a democratic and representative Board we are ultimately obligated to act on behalf of the organization as a whole and with the whole membership in mind – even when such actions might be different from what we ourselves personally feel or want. This group of Board Members argued that as a Board we are empowered by AAR members to follow any course of action which protects the AAR as an organization dedicated to the promotion of the academic study of religion. In short, they claim we are responsible to our members, all of them.

Despite the disagreements outlined above, there were several points that everyone seemed to agree on:

- that the workers stories were ones of serious despair;

- that we valued our relationship with SBL and wanted to act together with them;

- that the financial implications could be serious.

We then moved to consolidate a consensus over how to proceed.

*Grounds for consensus and a plan.*

Ultimately, a common commitment to individual members led to the outline of a consensus on at least an initial set of steps to be presented to the Society of Biblical Literature. From the discussion it was clear that all AAR Board members agreed that:

- AAR members ought to be informed about the boycott and the circumstances that led the union to call for help from others in their struggle with Hyatt.

- The AAR ought to avoid doing anything that would prevent AAR members whose consciences compel them to honor the boycott from being able to do so while participating in some aspect of our meeting.

On the basis of these two shared principles, both groups within the Board came to a consensus that the Executive Director should open negotiations with the SBL leadership around the following initial responses to the immediate circumstances of the Hyatt boycott:
Motion:

- That we agree to move all executive staff, board and comp-ed guests out of the Hyatt
- That we work on alternatives for disabled members who do not want to stay in the Hyatt
- That we move our daycare services to another location
- That we move placement out of the Hyatt - hopefully to the McCormick Center using pipe and draped spaces to replace the private rooms we reserved in the Hyatt
- That we work on ways to support Sabbath observant members who do not want to stay in the Hyatt
- That we move all programmatic meetings originally scheduled for the Hyatt to other locations
- That we formulate a letter informing members of the situation and the AAR/SBL responses as well as indicating alternative housing options (the precise language of that letter has yet to be formulated)

The motion passed unanimously.

**Action item:** The Executive Director will open negotiations with the SBL by communicating the contents of the “the Package” of proposals approved by the board under item 6.3, p. 14

Discussion of further steps including possible policies involving future contracts and pending contracts was put off till Sunday morning.

**7.0 Proposed Budget (continued)**

The discussion of the proposed budget was tabled earlier to leave room for additional discussion. The following suggestions were made by a Member with an eye toward informing the board regarding details in the AAR Budget. This Member suggested it would be helpful to the Board if the AAR:

a. were to use monthly “effort reporting” as a tool for explaining where the organization is committing its resources and to provide a more precise accounting of expenses associated with different AAR projects and programs. For example this would allow us to know with accuracy how much we are spending on each project so we can better assess its worth;
b. spelled out the “other meetings costs” line in more detail to help Board members understand these costs as we assess which are critical;

c. provided more details regarding the consultant line including information about contracts, how they are negotiated, under what terms, and with whom;

d. provide a schedule explaining when our policies regarding socially responsible investment will be achieved and how we will go about it;

e. initiate a discussion about the need for a development director.

**Motion to accept the Proposed Budget**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**8.0 AAR STAFF**

Jack spoke briefly about changes in the AAR’s staffing. Staff members were asked to provide “self-declared” job descriptions which were distributed to all Board Members. Jack reminded us that the AAR works under the umbrella of Emory University’s Human Resources policies and procedures.

**Discussion:**

Question: Do we have an organizational chart?

Answer: Yes, but it is shifting a bit as the staff continues to adjust to consequences stemming from recent layoffs.

Question: Are there formal job descriptions?

Answer: Yes, within the Emory system all positions have formal descriptions, but again those are in transition as mentioned above.

Question: Are there annual objectives and appraisals of performance?

Answer: Yes.

**General discussion:** There was a suggestion that the moves in the last 18 months have created stresses and strains on the staff as previous jobs have morphed into what appears more like a patchwork quilt than a clear pattern with each person putting energy into a job with clearly delineated responsibilities. To this end, it was also suggested that the AAR make greater use of “effort reporting” as a tool for gaining a more precise delineation of where individuals are spending their time, and
what the real costs are of the various projects and programs associated with the AAR.

Jack responded that it is true that our staff is called on to juggle many disparate responsibilities. Moreover, there is a seasonal rhythm to the AAR’s work flow which distorts what might be visible on a standard organizational chart.

**Action item:** Jack will provide the Board Members with the most up to date organizational chart and formal job descriptions.

### 9.0 Mini-Summit Meeting of CREM, SWIP and LGBTIQ Committees

Member Advocate Janet Jakobsen reported on the mini-summit involving the Committee on Racial and Ethnic Minorities, the Status of Women in the Profession Committee and the Status of Lesbian, Gay, Bi-Sexual, Transgendered, Intersex and Queer Persons Committee.

Janet reported that bringing together groups that have been typically separated from one another to consider ways their interests overlap and reinforce one another was very productive and should be encouraged to continue. The energy was very high as the meeting began, and escalated throughout the weekend.

### 9.1 Mini-Summary Report by Member Advocate

*A Smaller Board – less influence?*

Janet reported that in the early part of the mini-summit there was some suspicion that the transition to the new Board model (i.e. the new smaller Board w/o direct representative from each committee) might signal disempowerment for these groups relative to the way things were. Toward the end, however, there was there was a gathering consensus among the members at the meeting that if the Board took up and discussed their proposed actions this model could promote a healthy back and forth collaborative relationship with the board.

*Continuing the conversation?*

Janet reported consensus among the participants that genuine progress would be facilitated by additional face-to-face meetings of this kind among the 3 committees. It was Janet’s recommendation that the board take seriously the need to be proactive in creating strategies that enable members of these groups to wrestle productively with fundamental questions rather than waiting till frustrations boil over and are harder to repair. Moreover, it was her sense that these groups often wrestle with questions which may seem particular to their constituencies but which ultimately reflect the concerns of the membership as a whole. She suggested we move from a specifying minoritizing view about these problems to a universalizing
view of what the issues are. That should be our strategy and that’s why we would want to invest in allowing these members to meet regularly.

Discussion: In response to the collective request for these three committees to continue meeting face-to-face, the Board undertook a broader discussion of the costs, advantages and productivity of bringing committees together for face-to-face meetings and a discussion of the effectiveness of our committee structures overall. Jack reported that it cost some $130,000 to bring all committees together for a major summit in a given year. One idea was to do a mini-summit of different groups every year with different groups. This mini-summit ran about $30,000, as the members surrendered two free nights of lodging at the AM to help make it happen. Jack suggested that in general, the AAR is more generous with room nights at AM than is the case with most comparably sized ACLS organizations. In addition, he reported great unevenness in the productivity of committees, with some focusing on ambitious agendas while others have settled into fairly predictable AM programming strategies. In fact, as some committees have largely brought their attention to formulating STF’s and other AM-based programs, there may even be some sense to bringing some of our committees into the orbit of the Program Committee. Other ideas included finding ways for Board members to meet with or at least have more direct relations with the various committees – even having every board member meet with one or two committees so we “know what’s going on with them.” At one point the AAR tried to get together a task force to evaluate the committees. That never got off the ground, perhaps it is time to try again? Perhaps we should have another go at an evaluation of the AAR’s committees?

9.2 Mini-Summit Proposals

The Board then took up the proposals stemming from the mini-summit.

From mini summit report (numbers are original numbering in report):

#4 We propose that the Program Committee more clearly delineate to the AAR membership pathways for proposing intersectional and integrative scholarship, especially across the new clusters, for presentation at the Annual Meeting.

Discussion: We should begin to pursue this by facilitating a phone conversation with the Program Committee Chairs and Robert Puckett to handle this.

Endorsed.

Action Item: Phone call between Robert Puckett and Program Committee Chairs

#3 The joint committees will be piloting a mentoring program this year; we propose that the AAR offer each of our 30 mentors the lowest published rate (student) on Annual Meeting registration as compensation for their work during the year, and
that the AAR offer to write a letter to each mentor's institution describing her or his work for the Academy.

Discussion: There was general enthusiasm for this proposal with the added suggestion that the project be developed in consultation with the AAR's Graduate Student Committee. In addition, there were suggestions that the pilot program be seen as just one of the conduits through which people connect up, and that as the program develops project leaders be careful not to instantiate new sub-groups or select groups which effectively alienate while including. In short, one danger of any such program is its capacity to replicate in miniature the larger structures it is designed to overcome. Moreover, the Member Advocate urged that we see this and the other proposals stemming from this summit as ideas initially designed to address the specific concerns of this particular sub-groups within the AAR membership as ultimately about correcting systemic problems that apply to the entire membership. On this model, the mentoring program is truly a pilot designed to test out the effectiveness of a particular course of action which could be scaled up and thus contribute to the AAR's overall need to create significantly more support for the professional development of its members. Other ideas, such as AAR ex-Board members or others serving as ombudsmen were explored. Always we need to be aiming for the professional development for the future of the academy rather than its past.

To take into account some of the points made above the original proposal was reworded as follows (see italics):

#3 The joint committees and the Graduate Student Committee will be piloting a mentoring program this year; we propose that the AAR offer each of our 30 mentors the lowest published rate (student) on Annual Meeting registration as compensation for their work during the year, and that the AAR offer to write a letter to each mentor's institution describing her or his work for the Academy.

Endorsed with the additional suggestion that the AAR's Graduate Student Committee be included in the planning process.

Action item: Communicate rate adjustments to mentors (when appointed) and generate letter to each mentor's institution describing his/her work.

#7 Because the Member Advocate is intended to represent our constituencies we propose that SWP, REM, LGBTIQ, and the proposed Committee on the Status of Persons with Disabilities in the Profession, be allowed to provide a final slate of two candidates to the body responsible for appointing the Member Advocate, similar to the current procedure for selecting the Program Unit representative.

Discussion: There was some concern that this proposal assumes the Member Advocate position was designed to represent only the constituencies present at the meeting (along with the soon to be formed group represented persons with
Some Board members argued that the scope of the member advocate position had always been understood to represent the broader membership rather than a group more narrowly defined by their minority status. While there was consensus that among Board members that allowing itself to be guided by the recommendations of these committees was a good thing, it would be important for all to remember that the Member Advocate position is designed to serve the broader membership rather than just the groups represented in this mini-summit. To that end, it was suggested that their proposal be reworded slightly as follows (see italics insert):

#7 Because the Member Advocate is intended to represent our constituencies along with the broader membership we propose that SWP, REM, LGBTIQ, and the proposed Committee on the Status of Persons with Disabilities in the Profession, be allowed to provide a final slate of two candidates to the body responsible for appointing the Member Advocate, similar to the current procedure for selecting the Program Unit representative.

**Endorsed with the additional phrase “along with the broader membership.”**

**Action item:** Nominations committee chair should be in touch with the chairs of SWP, REM and LGBTIQ to discuss a process for providing a slate of candidates for the Member Advocate Board Position.

#11 We propose that the AAR find ways to process and analyze on a regular basis all of the data that have been and are currently being collected from members, Employment Center participants, and departments. The current level of data analysis is simply the presentation of raw data; the AAR needs cross-tabulations at the very least and ideally multivariate analysis of the collected data in order to understand the changes taking place in the field and especially the dynamics of inequality that affect our constituents.

**Discussion:** In general there was consensus that gathering and analyzing the information called for in this proposal is both important but also quite difficult. In fact, the proposal underestimates just how woefully uninformed we are regarding the basic demographic information that would give us some insight into who are members are. Moreover, there was a complaint that because we currently gather our demographic information via the membership application form, we inadvertently make it seem as if surrendering that information is a condition of becoming an AAR member. In light of the above concerns, the Board suggested endorsing proposal #11 while calling for us to end the collection of sexual orientation data until we have a more comprehensive plan for all of our demographic information.

**Endorsed, with the additional decision to contact the relevant groups about ceasing to collect racial and sexual orientation data until this could be done in a systematic and comprehensive manner at a time other than when a person...**
signs on for membership.

**Action item:** Current Member advocate Janet Jakobsen will reach out to the chairs of the relevant committees to discuss the concerns and to propose a temporary halt to the collection of such data.

#1. We propose that the AAR develop and support a sustainable approach to continuing the conversation between our committees and developing a process for producing concrete proposals that will lead to effective change within the Academy. Ideally, this approach would be to continue to hold an annual summit.

Discussion: The Board talked about balancing its desire for the 3 committees that participated in this summit to build on and extend their good work with the knowledge that the AAR cannot afford to bring all of its committees together for face-to-face meetings annually. A general discussion ensued in which we rehearsed the way the fiscal crisis of 2008-10 forced us to undertake a series of significant economizing moves – one of which was the decision to push the committees to doing more of their face-to-face meeting at the Annual Meeting. Ultimately it seemed to the Board that the issues raised in this proposal were three-fold. One has to do with the overall effectiveness of our AAR committees generally. This comes up as we ask ourselves whether face-to-face meetings for all of the committees would be a productive use of the AAR’s limited resources. In answer to this issue, the Board proposes the creation of a sub-committee that will look toward establishing a process for reviewing committee effectiveness. Secondly, there’s the cost of creating face-to-face meeting spaces, a problem that involves all the committees, not just these three, but that is related to the evaluation question. But then third, there are the special circumstances surrounding the work that we’ve initiated with these committees in this mini-summit, and the need for us to reach out to these three constituencies in particular to ensure that their efforts move forward with dispatch. To that end two proposals were put forward in response to this request:

Proposal: To create a sub-committee of the Board charged with developing and carrying out a procedure for evaluating the effectiveness of AAR committees.

**This proposal was endorsed unanimously.**

**Action Item:** A sub-committee of the Board should be charged with developing and carrying out a procedure for evaluating the effectiveness of AAR committees.

A proposal to endorse #1 from the mini-summit report with the following modification (see italics):

#1. We propose that the AAR develop and support a sustainable approach to continuing the conversation between our committees and developing a process for producing concrete proposals that will lead to effective change within the Academy. Ideally, this approach would be to continue to hold an annual summit. While
pursuing new resources, including new fund raising strategies, the AAR will aim to holding mini-summits with the CREM, SWIP and LGBTIQ committees every other year, with the next meeting scheduled to happen in fiscal year 2014.

**Endorsed with a commitment to hold another mini-summit in fiscal year 2014.**

**Action item:** Board’s endorsement of a mini-summit in fiscal year 2014 should be communicated to the committee chairs.

The Board turned next to the mini-summit report’s informal proposals:

1. We request that the AAR gather information from other, comparably-sized ACLS members regarding best practices with reference to the following issues in insurgent scholarship and scholars from non-dominant groups:
   a. Supporting such scholars into and through the tenure process.
   b. Supporting the publication and dissemination of insurgent scholarship.
   c. Responding to new market realities that disproportionately affect scholars from non-dominant groups.
   d. The ability of committees representing such groups to engage in public advocacy.

**Endorsed unanimously**

**Action Item:** Generate “best practices” survey regarding supporting faculty through the tenure process for dissemination to ACLS organizations of a size comparable to the AAR.

2. We request that the AAR include space on the new web site for fostering alliances with groups from other ACLS societies that also represent non-dominant constituencies.

**Discussion:** The Board was unclear about aspects of this question. Jack will request clarification before bringing it back to the Board for additional discussion.

**Tabled pending clarification**

**Action item:** Jack will speak to the chairs and request clarification on the proposal to create a new website for fostering alliances with groups from other ACLS societies that also represent non-dominant constituencies.

3. We request that the AAR develop, and make readily and continuously accessible to its members, flow charts of the organization’s leadership and communication structures and of the process whereby those who fill such positions are selected.

**Endorsed unanimously.**

**Action item:** AAR Executive Staff will produce a flow chart describing the
organization's leadership and communication structures, to be made available to the membership.

The Board then returned to the formal proposals stemming from the mini-summit:

#6 We propose that individual committees be allowed to engage in public advocacy around issues that concern our constituents, without requiring the approval of the Executive Committee.

#5 We propose that the AAR develop guidelines for engagement in public advocacy, both within and beyond the Academy, such as its actions taken in the context of the Tariq Ramadan case, the ERA, and bans on same-sex marriage.

Discussion: The board initiated a conversation about proposals #5 and #6. Initially there was some support among members for supporting both proposals – which were taken to be requests to initiate a process that would culminate in a set of policies rather than an assertion of a particular form or formula for handling these issues. At the same time others were very concerned that this was a matter that called for significant and extended discussion and not something that we were prepared to take up at this point in the weekend. All acknowledged that question of advocacy can be vexing for a member-based organization. Several Board Members acknowledged the critical importance of having clear guidelines for handling the public advocacy issue.

Tabled with a commitment to return to these proposals at a later date.

10.0 Note to the Minutes re: Otto’s Plenary Speakers

As it is likely that the plenary speakers invited to the Annual Meeting by President Madura will be working on migration and immigration issues, the Board urges that the AAR make every effort to draw to the attention of our members the connection the way their presentations illuminate issues the Academy is dealing with directly as it responds to the Unite Here – Hyatt labor dispute.

Adjourned for the day: 5:30PM

SUNDAY 4/22

Present: Donna Bowman, Elonda Clay, John Esposito, Jack Fitzmier, Warren Frisina, Janet Jakobsen, David Kim, Laurie Zoloth

Staff: Steven Herrick
Regrets: David Kyuman Kim, Otto A. Maduro, Roberto Lint Sagarena

11. Call to order

The AAR Board meeting reconvened at 9:00AM Sunday morning.

12. Review of Agenda

Jack reviewed the agenda of items left to cover. They included:
   a. Future implications of the Hyatt labor dispute for our other contracts over
      the next 10 years so that we do not have to have the same debate annually
   b. Reviewing remaining committee reports
   c. Appointments
   d. Related Scholarly Organization renewals and applications

13. Hyatt Labor Dispute – Further Steps and Future Implications

As it had agreed on Saturday, the Board began Sunday’s meeting by taking up the
question of further steps it might pursue in light of the Hyatt Labor dispute
including policies involving future contracts and pending contracts.

Discussion: Jack reviewed the “package” of steps we had approved and indicated he
would bring them to SBL. He pointed out there may be some moves which once
made could be hard to undo if the Union and Hyatt were to settle. The implication
was that there may be some non-recoverable costs once we begin to move forward.
Those costs won’t be retrievable if the hotel and union settle after the fact. He was
thus urged to begin immediately to calculate and report the costs entailed in the
proposals sent forward to SBL and he agreed to begin this promptly, including costs
associated with finding new rooms for members.

The Board Members next discussed several strategic moves that should be
considered looking forward. Among the options mentioned were:

   a. Bringing the AAR/SBL boards together with a negotiator to discuss how to
      proceed to express our serious intentions.
   b. Initiating negotiations directly with the Hyatt Chief Executive Officer, rather
      than with local Hyatt management possibly with the help of a professional
      negotiator.
   c. Making clear to Hyatt management that what’s at risk is not just this year’s
      contracts but all future contracts with Hyatt until they settle with Unite Here.
   d. Making clear to Hyatt management and City leaders that $42 million in
      economic impact is at stake.
   e. Share our decisions with the other ACLS organizations with the thought of
      multiplying our impact and the threat as a whole.
   f. Inserting force majeure language into existing and future contracts that
would hold the AAR harmless in the event that a hotel and its workers are unable to come to agreement in a labor dispute.

After rehearsing these options, the question was asked: “Are we willing to break this contract?” and the discussion shifted to strategy and tactics.

Board Members who had been arguing that the AAR ought to adopt a position of solidarity with organized labor encouraged us to authorize a negotiator to represent to the Hyatt group that the AAR remains open to breaking this contract. Their arguments emphasized relationships of power and moral authority in such matters. If our strongest weapon in this fight is the threat to break the contract, it seemed counter-intuitive to these Board Members to let go of that weapon at this stage in the confrontation. A threat to break this contract, which was the stand taken by the Procter conference with significant success, coupled with the clear promise to break additional contracts down the line would have maximum impact, and would be consistent with their view that we have a moral responsibility to exercise what power we have on behalf of those who are relatively powerless.

Also important to those arguing this position is the timing of our responses. As members are currently signing up for rooms, and as the semester’s end is hard upon us, there is only a limited amount of time remaining to carry out the 7 steps outlined in the package that we approved to be presented to SBL. Moreover, these Board Members believed we have an obligation to report out our deliberations quickly to the membership – especially to those who have been writing and/or petitioning us.

In sum, those who advocated this position thought we should go into these negotiations indicating a willingness to break the contract, although they were NOT at this point ready to recommend that we do so.

Board Members who had resisted the assumption that the AAR’s mission entails direct engagement in labor disputes generally resisted the conclusion that we should take seriously the option of breaking the contract for our 2012 meeting. Having acceded to the steps outlined in the “package” with the aim of ensuring that no AAR member be forced against his/her conscience to break the boycott, this group argued on practical grounds that we harm ourselves unnecessarily if we take the next step and walk away from the contract itself. In fact, their view is that we do more harm to Hyatt by diminishing our role in the building and not breaking the contract than we would if we were to walk away completely. By locating alternative housing for AAR members who want it, and by eliminating all other conference business in the hotel, we’ve minimized the amount of money Hyatt can earn from the meeting. Moreover, we’ve avoided paying penalties that begin at $500,000 and could grow to $750,000. If the SBL agrees to go along with our proposals we’d have maximized the pain Hyatt feels while minimizing the harm to the AAR. Absent the underlying assumption that we have a moral obligation to act in a specific way, this group sees not breaking the contract as a common sense option that should be applauded by Unite Here were it explained to them.
Ultimately, all Board Members indicated they were committed to doing all they could to ensure that NO member is obligated to use the Hyatt against his/her conscience. With that as common ground all Board members reiterated an endorsement of the “package” as well.

In addition, the Board took up on an addendum to the “package” which while remaining agnostic on the question of breaking the 2012 contract and focuses on strengthening our negotiating position in two ways.

1. Given the complexities of this situation, and given the relative absence of direct experience in labor negotiation within the Academy, it was recommended that the AAR and SBL engage a professional negotiator to bring our case to the Hyatt CEO as well as other relevant parties who might help bring this to a resolution. Some thought a person with a background in Chicago should be considered (e.g. Abner Mikva).

2. The negotiator would be authorized to indicate that the AAR (and hopefully SBL) are ready to rethink all Hyatt contracts going forward in light of this impasse. Our goal would be to eliminate the threat of this kind of disruption in future meetings perhaps through the insertion of a force majeure clause which would hold us harmless were we to feel compelled to walk away from contracts with hotels undergoing labor disputes.

Any action beyond that outlined in this motion would require additional deliberation by the Board.

The motion:

As an addendum to the motion passed under 6.3, p. 12 above (otherwise known in this document as “the package”): That the AAR (hopefully with SBL)
   a. Engage a negotiator to help with the process of representing our interests regarding the Hyatt/Unite Here labor dispute.
   b. That this negotiator be authorized to indicate that we are moving ahead with a process to resolve this issue for all of our contracts in the future.

The motion was approved, 6 aye, 2 abstentions

Action item: The addendum proposing the engagement of a negotiator who is authorized to indicate that we are moving ahead with a process of resolving this issue for all of our contracts in the future be included with the other items in “the package” sent to initiate negotiations with SBL on the Hyatt matter.

14.0 Committee Reports (continued)

14.1 Program Committee
Nelly van Dorn indicated that in addition to its regular duties, the Program Committee had taken up the question of the participation of foreign (i.e. non U.S. based) members in the annual meeting. Some disgruntlement was reported regarding the acceptance rate of paper proposals from foreign members. However, a quick survey seemed to indicate no significant difference in the acceptance rates. Recognizing that we are moving new more global directions, especially in light of our enhanced relationship with the International Association for the History of Religions, the Program Committee began to ask itself whether it should be concerned with developing new strategies that cater to international members in ways that will strengthen our ties and extend our relationships.

Ideas that were floated included thoughts about digital links to AAR sessions; new strategies for increasing the number of international members attending the meeting physically etc.

Discussion: It was suggested that the Program Committee might do well to engage directly with the members of the International Connections Committee to pursue this question further.

Action item: Program Committee and International Connections Committee chairs will consult about overlapping interests in international member participation in Annual Meeting.

14.2 Regions Committee

Brian Pennington reported on the Regions Committee’s activities, which included the ongoing development of a Regional Coordinators Handbook, a request for space at the Annual Meeting where regional boards might meet and plan, and development of a process for proposing a slate of 4 candidates for the regional director position in the board.

Brian also reported on the progress of creating Limited Liability Corporations for all of the regions, a project that was begun to bring some consistency in the relationship between the AAR’s national organization and its regional units. Eight of 10 regions have signed LLC agreements with new bylaws.

14.3 Nominations Committee

The Nominations Committee report contained a slate of candidates for the upcoming elections as well as some reflections on policy questions regarding the committee’s structure and its procedures.

14.3.1 Nominations
The nominations committee reports there will be four elections held with the following nominees:
14.3.2 Policy and Procedural Issues

Noting changes related to the AAR’s new governance structures, the Nominations Committee reported with some concern that the new structure reduces the committee’s interactions with the board to a degree that may be problematic. To remedy this the committee made the following suggestions:

a. That the chair of the Nominating Committee meet every Fall with the Board’s Executive Committee.

b. That the Executive Director meet with the Nominating Committee each year at its opening dinner to brief the committee on its particular charge for the year.

c. And to preserve continuity, that the chair serve for two years (instead of one); that one more appointed member be added to the committee; that the terms be increased from 3 to 4 years; with the chair being appointed after having served for 2 years.

d. That the bylaws be amended to indicate properly that the Member-Advocate Director (not the At-Large Director) sits with the committee.

Discussion: A general discussion of the proposals put forward by the committee yielded the following motion:

Motion: To accept the slate of nominees, to have the executive director meet with the nominating committee each year at the Committee’s opening dinner to brief the committee on the charge for the year; and to have the Nominating Committee Chair meet with the Executive Committee at the Annual Meeting.

Approved unanimously

The Board put the discussion of the proposed bylaw revisions (including changes in the committee terms), and of the precise description of the description of the
Treasurer’s position off to the next formal meeting.

**Action Items:** Proceed with the arranging the election; arrange for the executive director to meet with the committee; arrange for the Nominating Committee Chair to meet with the Executive Committee during the Annual Meeting.

### 15.0 Related Scholarly Organizations

**Renewal**
The AAR received a request for renewal of Related Scholarly Organization Status for the Buddhist Christian Studies Group

**Motion for renewal**

**Approved unanimously**

**New application**
The AAR received a request to be accepted as a Related Scholarly Organization from the International Association of Shin Buddhist Studies.

**Motion to accept**

**Approved unanimously**

**Action item:** Contact Buddhist-Christian Studies Group and International Association of Shin Buddhist Studies regarding their renewal and acceptance respectively.

**Motion to adjourn 11:30 AM**

**Approved unanimously**
ACTION ITEMS FROM 4/21-22 AAR BOARD MEETING

**Action item:** David Kim and Laurie Zoloth will review past letters and draft a response appropriate to the Northern Iowa situation. (p. 3)

**Action item:** The Executive Director will open negotiations with the SBL by communicating the contents of the “the Package” of proposals approved by the board under item 6.3, p. 14

**Action item:** Jack will provide the Board Members with the most up to date organizational chart and formal job descriptions. (p. 16)

**Action Item:** Phone call between Robert Puckett and Program Committee Chairs (p. 17)

**Action item:** Communicate rate adjustments to mentors (when appointed) and generate letter to each mentor’s institution describing his/her work. (p. 18)

**Action item:** Nominations committee chair should be in touch with the chairs of SWP, REM and LGBTIQ to discuss a process for providing a slate of candidates for the Member Advocate Board Position. (p. 19)

**Action item:** Current Member advocate Janet Jakobsen will reach out to the chairs of the relevant committees to discuss the concerns and to propose a temporary halt to the collection of such data. (p. 20)

**Action Item:** A sub-committee of the Board should be charged with developing and carrying out a procedure for evaluating the effectiveness of AAR committees. (p. 20)

**Action item:** Board’s endorsement of a mini-summit in fiscal year 2014 should be communicated to the committee chairs. (p. 21)

**Action Item:** Generate “best practices” survey regarding supporting faculty through the tenure process for dissemination to ACLS organizations of a size comparable to the AAR. (p. 25)

**Action item:** Jack will speak to the chairs and request clarification on the proposal to create a new website for fostering alliances with groups from other ACLS societies that also represent non-dominant constituencies. (p. 21)

**Action item:** The addendum proposing the engagement of a negotiator who is authorized to indicate that we are moving ahead with a process of resolving this issue for all of our contracts in the future be included with the other items in “the package”
sent to initiate negotiations with SBL on the Hyatt matter. (p. 25)

**Action Items:** Proceed with the arranging the election; arrange for the executive director to meet with the committee; arrange for the Nominating Committee Chair to meet with the Executive Committee during the Annual Meeting. (p. 27)

**Action item:** Contact Buddhist-Christian Studies Group and International Association of Shin Buddhist Studies regarding their renewal and acceptance respectively. (p. 29)