

Committee on Publications meeting
ASOR office, Boston
April 25 and 26, 2002

PRESENT: Billie Jean Collins (ex officio), Rudy Dornemann (ex officio), Al Leonard, Piotr Michalowski, Joe Seger (ex officio), Jim Weinstein
VIA PHONE: Ted Lewis, Andy Vaughn, Gloria London, Ann Killebrew,
VISITING: Britt Hartenberger (staff), Larry Herr, Selma Omerefendic (staff), Richard Scheuer, Charles Watkinson (David Brown books)

6:00pm Call to order by Leonard.

After a welcome by Al Leonard, the meeting was passed over to Larry Herr, incoming Chair of COP. The Agenda was re-arranged, with discussion on fulfillment moved forward. Herr thanked those assembled.

1. David Brown Books

Charles Watkinson, our contact with David Brown (our distributor), discussed the services that they provide for us. They are a branch of Oxbow Books of the UK, and provide marketing and distribution of our books, as well as being a publisher of others' books. Watkinson passed around a handout listing their benefits and charges and an example of a customer list of several recent ASOR publications. They mail a quarterly catalog to 15,000 customers and sell at conferences such as AIA, AOS, SAA, and others. They hold ASOR's inventory on consignment, store and insure our stock of books and back issues, fulfill orders, and market our books. They send out some review copies of our books, while the Publications office sends out others. Orders for our books can be made directly through David Brown on their website (15-20% of their business), by mail, or by phone, or through our Publications office.

Their charges to us are as a percentage of value of sales, and this percentage level depends on marketing. They take 38% of most sales and 20% of standing orders. Other charges to us include fees for long-term storage and sending out missed issues.

They provide three major benefits: specialist marketing, the Oxbow connection makes international orders easier, and an independent identity, since they provide identity instead of theirs.

Killebrew asked if Institutional representatives were ever sent letters encouraging them to take out standing orders? Collins reported that the Publications office has done this in the past. Watkinson reported that the person replacing him (Ian Stephens) will be quite interested in promoting standing orders.

2. Agenda. Herr summarized his goals for the meeting: hold a regular COP meeting, explain Larry's agenda in Chairing COP, and teaching all committee members about COP's activities and finances. He would like to see an active, educated committee that operates smoothly and effectively by itself and in cooperation with the ASOR office.

3. Presentation of COP budget and finances by Collins.

Collins reported that we have switched to a fully accrued accounting system in the last year, after some fears that Publications was operating with a deficit. An accrual basis means that revenue is

Page 3, Journals statement. Revenues come from membership dues and institutional subscriptions. Fulfillment costs so far are \$22,904 for three quarters, probably \$27,500 for the full year. They charge us a per-record fee for membership and mailings. Payments from the Nies bequest are likely to be regular.

Discussion of late issues. If we haven't provided a product, revenues for this period have to be deferred. For example, one NEA makes \$25,000. If it doesn't come out, we can't count it. We do get to defer its expenses. There will probably be three late issues again this year. Lewis reports that there is more material in the pipeline now for NEA.

Page 2, Publications Profit & Loss. Collins reports that the bottom line for Publications is \$12,000 in the red. If we add Nies and Torch funds that were transferred in, then we are only \$3,700 in the red. Weinstein asked if Development is asking for funds for Publications. Seger commented that this is included with its other objectives, but if we want a Publications focus, COP should initiate this. Killebrew asks that people specify these donations as towards Publications, not just the Torch Campaign. She suggests that we advertise more in journals to attract donations from subscribers who could give directly to Publications.

Page 1, Assets and Liabilities (this is not a balance sheet). The temporarily restricted fund is the Publications "opportunity fund." Depreciation and some expenses are not included on this sheet. Cash flow has not been a problem this year, so we have not tapped into the opportunity fund. Accounts Receivable includes those people/institutions billed but whose money we have not yet received. Academic Services reports to us what has been billed. As we receive money, it is then counted as income and is taken out of Accounts Receivable. Michalowski noted that in Europe, people can set up a system whereby regular yearly payments (such as for memberships) are made directly from their bank account, though he has not seen this in U.S. Clark reported that SBL has an arrangement like this.

Collins defined some of the terms used on this sheet. Deferred book production means expenses on books that we have produced that we have not yet counted. As books are sold, this amount decreases. Deferred income includes items like income for late issues on NEA. This is listed as \$22,000 now though it should be about \$75,000. Pre-paids are deferred revenues, for new people who were not billed, or people we stopped billing who have joined or subscribed again on their own.

Publications FY03 Projections handout

Pages 13 & 14 Membership and subscription allocated costs. Collins would like to eliminate the Associate Discounted category (for retired people and students) (categories C0 and C1 on page 14). She suggests we lower the Associate dues to \$50 from \$60.

MOTION: Michalowski moves that we eliminate the Associate discounted category and moves that we change the dues from \$60 to \$50. All yeas, none opposed. PASSED UNIMOUSLY with no abstentions.

Collins suggests that we increase institutional subscription rates for BASOR from \$110 to \$120 beginning Jan. 1, 2003. NEA could increase from \$75 to \$80. A typical industry increase is 10% per year, and we haven't had any increase for two years. There was discussion about whether we will lose libraries by raising these rates. There are already concerns about NEA

The issue of number of books we can handle in a year was raised, and Collins indicated we produced five or six this year, depending on the book and whether we are typesetting it in-house. Weinstein recommends professional copyediting for some books and suggests that we need to be firmer in future with scheduling in terms of setting dates and deadlines. Weinstein suggests a terminal date beyond which we no longer accept a book.

Page 6. General and administrative (G & A). Collins proposes to give a raise to Madell in FY03 and hire him as a regular employee. He doesn't get the benefits that we currently pay for via Emory. Herr suggests that we look at other jobs Madell might do in addition (membership/subscription fulfillment). If we hired him full-time for membership/subscriptions, then our G&A will go up about \$7-\$10,000. But we are also paying Academic Services (AS) about \$20,675 already for frustrating fulfillment service. Software costs for starting up these services are about \$12,000, and we must also give Academic Services three months' notice to cancel our contract. Herr indicates that we are too small for more sophisticated fulfillment companies. We could also hire a student for part-time data entry work. Collins noted that Jim Henderson of AS treats our membership unprofessionally (doesn't return their calls). Michalowski suggests someone presents us with a detailed statement of pros and cons before we make a final decision. He worries about problems of attrition like there were in the Scholars Press to Academic Services transition. It was asked whether a review of software, what other societies do etc., could be completed by the end of May so that we can make a decision by then. Henderson's assistant leaves in June, so we should move before September. It was decided to vote yes unless the move was not cost-effective.

MOTION that we agree on moving to in-house fulfillment in principle and authorize Collins to explore and report to us on the various parameters involved by May. **SECONDED** by Lewis. **AGREED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Michalowski suggests we approve \$15/hour for Madell. The ASOR Personnel committee should be involved with developing a job description for the permanent position.

MOTION that effective with the beginning of the next pay period at Emory, Madell's salary be raised to \$15 an hour based on 37.5 hours. Michalowski seconds. **AGREED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Page 2. Publications Profit and Loss.

This sheet represents the same figures plus administration expenses, and shows that we are about \$46,000 in the black. If we defer \$75,000 for NEA and the BASOR rate increase takes effect, we will be about \$35,000 in the black.

Herr commended Collins for her hard work in preparing the detailed, clear handouts.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30pm.

Meeting resumed on Friday morning

PRESENT: Collins (ex officio), Dornemann (ex officio), Feinman, Leonard, Michalowski, Seger (ex officio), Weinstein,

VIA PHONE: Killebrew, Lewis, London, Vaughn,

VISITING: Clark, Frederick, Geraty, Hartenberger (staff), Herr, Ritterspach, Scheuer

4. Membership / Subscription separation

Seger suggested we review separating membership and subscription. How do we account for ourselves? Memberships are tied in with subscriptions, so it is difficult to tell the full range of ASOR 'members.' Several other organizations have moved to strictly membership, with subscriptions tacked on to membership categories, so that members get discounted subscriptions but it is possible to separate members and subscribers. Herr said that some people come into ASOR via Annual Meetings, and that a few Board members have suggested that we try to increase membership in ASOR among laypeople. MacAllister had suggested that laypeople would be attracted to the archaeology in NEA more than BASOR.

Collins indicated that SBL has made this change, instituting a flat membership rate of \$50 for professional members. This change has raised their membership income. They also created an associate rate, which we already have. Membership includes electronic access to journals with printed copies available for an extra fee. SBL's individual subscriptions went from 7500 to 3000, though it would not affect the institutional subscribers (such as libraries). This meant a considerable savings for them in printing costs. We would not save as much on printing and mailing costs because our circulation is much smaller than theirs. Currently, though, the journals are a benefit of membership. If we were to separate and raise membership to \$50 and all present members rejoined and re-subscribed (100% 'rollover'), we would have \$17,000 more a year. If we had only 80% rollover, we would only break even.

Weinstein notes that we have already lost non-academics (those more interested in NEA) to Shanks and BAS. Killebrew points out that the membership fee doesn't make a huge difference to non-academics, and if the fee were raised we probably wouldn't lose them. Seger noted that we need a way to create a list of people we can go to for lay support, such as a 'friends' group, and use this as a way to find potential Trustees. We need to remain a source of more in-depth information for those who are already Biblical Archaeology Society members. Herr indicated that the journals were originally added to membership categories to make membership more attractive. Scheuer recommended that we keep lay people interested. We should offer trips to members once in a while.

Michalowski suggests that we lost our opportunity to reach the public to Hershel Shanks. We can't compete with his appeal to a populist audience. Ritterspach noted that a recent lecture in Indianapolis by William Dever reached 300 people, all non-specialists, so lecture events are part of Development plans and will bring in the public. London asks how we bring people into our Annual Meetings. Clark replies that we don't do public relations well and that CAMP will be addressing this in the future.

5. ASOR Manual and Guidelines

The entire ASOR Manual is an Executive Committee document, and any changes made to it should be recommended to the Board. Frederick noted that the COP Guidelines should be consistent with the ASOR Manual, and indicated that they can be an annex to it, annex F in the current Manual. Seger noted that we need to separate the duties of COP and ASOR. Only major changes in the COP Guidelines, once adopted, need go before the Board. Frederick suggested that COP decide that it will have guidelines and procedures that it will use, and that it can change these later.

London moved that the COP guidelines and ASOR manual be worked out to conform with each other. SECONDED by Feinman. APPROVED with one abstention.

6. COP Guidelines and Procedures

Re: 4.1.2. of COP Guidelines

Scheuer indicated that Arab nations are involved in the UN, and if ASOR follows UN regulations, people will begin to leave ASOR in protest. He is concerned that UNESCO is

MOTION to accept these Draft Guidelines and recommend them to the ASOR Exec. Committee and Board to be adopted subject to minor emendations which will be worked out in the next two weeks. SECONDED by Vaughn. APPROVED UNIMOUSLY with no abstentions.

7. New editorial appointments

The agenda lists the effective dates.

ASOR Annual editor from Lapp to Nancy Serwint.

Archae. Reports Series editor from London to Joe Greene.

ASOR Book Series editor from vacant to Brian Schmidt (as of Sept. 1, 2003) with Stuart Swiny for the next year (with Collins) until Schmidt begins.

BASOR editor remains Weinstein. Herr would like him to continue, though he might need a sabbatical.

Michalowski MOVES to accept these four names as editor appointments. SECONDED by Feinman. APPROVED UNIMOUSLY with no abstentions.

8. COP Executive Committee

12. Facilitating publication and marketing of CAP-approved excavations

Sten LaBianca has asked if projects approved by CAP but publishing with another press could advertise their ASOR affiliation. This was seen as a new benefit for CAP affiliated projects. We could help them market their books while spreading our name. They could include a page with ASOR's name and logo, a listing of CAP and COP chairs, and the words "ASOR-Affiliated excavation." They can advertise their publications as "similar to other ASOR books," and we could recommend that David Brown market them. It was agreed that the Executive Committee of COP should review applications. Agreed that LaBianca and other CAP-Affiliated projects could do this.

13. Electronic dissemination instead of offprints

Michalowski noted that authors can put up their own article on the web as an offprint in pdf format before it is even published in JCS. He suggests that we need to publish on-line and develop a system where these articles can be bought through ASOR. This will be discussed further in November. It was suggested that only electronic offprints be sent automatically, and paper copies if requested by the author. Currently, Collins works with editors to see if they would like to do this.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Britt Hartenberger