

## **2010 SSSR COUNCIL MEETING**

### **INTRODUCTIONS**

The meeting starts at 1:07 PM. Kay begins by asking everyone to introduce themselves. People went around the table introducing themselves.

- Present: Katherine Meyer (president), James Beckford (president elect), Rhys Williams (president-elect elect), Korie Edwards (Secretary), Art Farnsley (Executive Officer), Marie Cornwall (JSSR Editor) James Cavendish (Treasurer), and the following council members: John Bartowski, Jerome Bagett, Stewart Hoover, Gerardo Marti, Corwin Schmidt.
- Council members not present: Elaine Howard Ecklund and Mark Chaves (past president).

### **APPROVAL OF 2009 COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

Korie Edwards initiates approval of minutes. No concerns. Stewart Hoover motions to pass minutes. Seconded by John Bartowski. **Approved unanimously.** (Note: Korie Edwards does not participate in vote. She was not on council the previous year).

### **EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORT WITH 2009 BUDGET SUMMARY**

Art Farnsley brings to our attention several points from his report on page 11 of the SSSR Council Packet.

- Thirty percent of members are students and fourteen percent of our members are international or emeriti. Their dues are \$15 and \$20 respectively. Consequently, the income from the dues is low.
- The budget is in good condition. At the end of 2009, we had about a \$43,000 surplus. At the end of 2010, we are projected to have about a \$40,000 surplus.
- Shand Endowment:
  - Council can consider a vote on spending more of the money out of the Shand endowment. Only about half of the full amount available (\$52,800) was spent the prior year.
  - The money allocated for grants is taken out of the Shand Endowment account and placed into a separate bank account in Indianapolis at IUPUI.
  - According to the terms of the Shand endowment, \$17,000 is never to be used. [Addendum: Upon reviewing the minutes, Art Farnsley clarified this point per Kay Meyer's request. He rights in an email to Korie Edwards and Kay Meyer dated on November 8, 2010 the following: "Of the \$48,000 currently in the Shand spending account at IMCU, Art has determined that \$17,000 granted in past years will not be claimed. According to the terms of the Endowment, this money must be returned to principal."]
- A national external contractor is handling A/V equipment at the 2010 SSSR conference. The hotel cannot handle A/V equipment for eighteen meeting rooms. Using the external contractor also saves the organization money. Kay Meyer

made the final decision on this. If using an external contractor works, we may continue to do this in the future.

- As of today, meeting size this year is similar to that of Denver.
- Election went smoothly.
- The Westin Boston Waterfront was chosen for the 2013 meetings.

### **PROPOSAL TO CHANGE EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMPENSATION**

Kay Meyer asks Art Farnsley to leave the room since we are discussing the EOs compensation and will need to vote on this proposal. Before he does so, Kay Meyer thanks Art for being a wonderful Executive Officer. Others concur. Art Farnsley exits the room.

Kay Meyer explains that she asked James Beckford to handle the new contract for the Executive Officer compensation. James Beckford leads the discussion.

James Beckford Summarizes: Executive Officer (EO) coordinates the work of the society and far more. Art Farnsley has served four years and agreed last year to do an additional year. James consulted with several senior members in the society over a six month period. In the past, contract negotiations were “hit or miss.” The aim was to recommend a “formula” that was “firm”, “fair” and “transparent.” Having reviewed all the evidence and gained a full perspective of all the work that the EO does, James summarizes the following terms upon which all included in the discussion agree and which those in agreement see as being fair terms: a) EO spends ¼ of his/her time on society-related activities. This will be ¼ of a 12 month full time year; b) Compensation based on a ten month salary; c) The contract stipulates a 4 year term based in Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). James Beckford states that he is extremely impressed with Art Farnsley as EO and has no reservations offering him a contract. [Addendum: Upon reviewing the minutes, on November 5, 2010 Kay Meyer adds the following omission: IUPUI is paying for Art Farnsley’s health benefits.]

*Motion: James Beckford proposes a motion to accept the contract in the “Report on the Executive Officer’s contract” emailed by Kay Meyer on October 19, 2010 to council members and officers, president elect, president elect-elect. Jim Cavendish seconds the motion. Kay opens up the issue for discussion.*

Discussion: Stewart Hoover suggests that the process was somewhat “irregular.” He expresses a desire that in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of the term, that a SSSR “body” be made aware of the contract negotiations coming up. Kay clarifies that she and James Beckford realized this year that there was not an arrangement in place for an office or executive officer. IUPUI has continued to allow Art Farnsley to be the association’s EO without a clear contract in place. In SSSR’s budget there is no line item that specifies the EO’s monetary compensation. The money is allocated to the SSSR *office* and therefore goes directly to the university or center where the SSSR is located. From that allocation, the EO is compensated but all other office expenses are also taken out of the SSSR office budget. As a consequence,

additional expenses that arise have essentially been taken out of the EOs compensation. Corwin Schmidt then, in an effort to clarify Stewart's point, asks whether there should be a formal statement saying that in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of the EOs term, the SSSR body announces an opening and searches for a new Executive Officer. Stewart concurs and further states that the president elect and president elect elect should be involved in this process. Kay states that the negotiation is as much with the institution as with the officer. Corwin concurs offering that the process therefore takes a very long time. James Beckford says that the 3<sup>rd</sup> year may indeed be too late. The announcement and search should take place in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year; the EO decided upon by the 3<sup>rd</sup> year; the new EO should shadow the current EO during the 4<sup>th</sup> year. Rhys Williams offers that James Beckford and Kay Meyer brought him and Mark Chaves into the discussion about the new EO and contract negotiations. There was a lot of collective discussion. Rhys Williams says that he would be personally relieved if the first motion on the floor to accept the contract be accepted. Corwin notes that there are two budgets in the packet. Kay clarifies that the budget to be discussed depends on how the motion on the EO contract at IUPUI goes. One is for if it passes. The other is if it does not. James Beckford clarifies that the budget difference is \$4,000. He also further summarizes another term in the contract: IUPUI has an annual employee review. SSSR should match the IUPUI percentage increase. Kay interjects that it is customary (although not in the constitution) that SSSR has given an annual increase of 5% to the *office*.

- ❖ Kay calls for a vote on the motion made by James Beckford and seconded by James Cavendish to approve the "Report on the Executive Officer's contract" emailed by Kay Meyer on October 19, 2010 to council members and officers, president elect, president elect-elect and John Bartkowski. **Passes unanimously.**

#### **ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF RELIGION, ECONOMICS & CULTURE (ASREC)**

Corwin Schmidt inquires about ASREC owing SSSR \$6,000 as stated in the 2009 minutes. Art explains that a representative from ASREC asked SSSR to post its annual upcoming meeting on [www.sssrweb.org](http://www.sssrweb.org). Art agreed. The debt was brought up in this exchange. According to Art Farnsley, Laurence Iannacone "acknowledges debt" and then "nothing." Corwin makes a point to say this should be explicitly noted in the minutes.

#### **TREASURER'S REPORT**

James Cavendish, treasurer, reviews the budget. James Cavendish states that SSSR is in "good financial standing." The losses the endowment incurred were recovered in 2009. The association closed 2009 with a surplus of about \$24,000.

Discussion: Art interjects noting that SSSR has almost paid for the 2008 meeting losses, but there is still a net loss from the 2009 meeting. There was about a \$28,000 loss from the 2006 meetings in Portland. There has been no presidential discretionary money spent until Mark Chaves, who is, according to Art's knowledge, the first president to spend the presidential discretionary fund. Gerardo Marti asks where SSSR stands on the amount of funds allotted for grants.

Art clarifies that monies from the Shand endowment cannot be used for student research or student travel awards. Art has proposed in the budget \$3,000 for student travel and \$10,000 and reminds the members that last year's council voted that \$28,000 be used for grants. The grant investment was decreased because of losses incurred from the 2007 and 2008 meetings. Gerardo asks for clarification about whether there are stipulations about who can receive student research awards. Art explains that international and domestic students can receive awards. We do not give funds from Shand endowment to people who do not hold a terminal degree. James Beckford wonders if council receives auditor's report. James Cavendish says no, not usually, but certainly can. Art confirms that it is not customary for council to receive the auditor's report. James Beckford then makes a note that the EO allowance listed on the bottom of page 2 should not be \$22, 800 but \$22, 200. There is some questioning by Marie Cornwall and James Beckford about the \$2,300 decline listed by Blackwell Publishing royalties. Art explains this is merely an estimate. James Beckford asks if he needs a motion regarding the correction in the budget report. Marie Cornwall and Stewart Hoover attest that the report is itself the motion.

#### **NEW MOTION RE: STUDENT RESEARCH AWARDS**

Gerardo Marti makes a motion to increase the student research award from \$10,000 to a "greater amount?"

Discussion: Art Farnsley explains that by doing this we will be essentially projecting a greater annual loss than what is already stipulated in the budget by increasing this award amount. Rhys Williams interjects framing this loss as "loaning" money to the future of the discipline. Stewart Hoover requests that a specific figure be made.

*Revised motion made by Gerardo Marti is to raise the student research award from \$10,000 to \$15, 000. Stewart Hoover seconds motion.*

Art interjects explaining that the student research award is NOT the Jack Shand Student Research Award as stated on page 57 of the 2010 SSSR Council Packet. It is simply the Student Research Award. There is no money allocated from the Jack Shand for student awards, per requirements of the endowment.

- ❖ Kay calls for a vote on the motion on the floor. All are in favor. None against.  
**Passes unanimously.**

#### **NEW MOTION RE: PRESIDENT'S DISCRETIONARY BUDGET**

James Beckford initiates a discussion regarding the president's discretionary budget. He would like to increase the budget for the upcoming year from \$7,000 to \$10,000. This, he explains, is because he wants to be able to have funds available to subsidize participants coming from non-north American countries for the 2011 meetings.

Discussion: Kay Meyer explains that she used the president's discretionary monies for the 2010 meetings to fund the former presidents with graduate student

breakfast, and travel for international participants, among other activities that were not in the budget. Art Farnsley interjects explaining that the standard “for years” was \$12, 000 for the president’s discretionary budget. Council voted to decrease it to \$7, 000 during the 2006 meetings in Portland, OR because it was not being used. Mark Chaves last year used \$10, 000. He used the \$7,000 allocated to the president’s discretionary fund. Mark Chaves also requested that he be able to use \$3,000 from the previous year’s president’s discretionary fund. His request was granted by the 2008 council.

*Motion: Corwin Schmidt says he believes any motion made should be to increase the annual budget for the president’s discretionary monies to \$10,000. Gerardo Marti asks whether the discretionary budget can be used for anything that the president “sees fit” to use it for or is it just for funding international related activities. Kay Meyer explains, and Art Farnsley concurs, that it would be at the complete discretion of the president. Gerardo Marti then seconds the motion.*

Discussion: James Cavendish asks whether money left in the budget for the president’s discretionary fund rolls over to the following year if the money is not used. Art Farnsley says “No.” This was a one time request by 2008 council. [Addendum: Upon reviewing minutes, on November 5, 2010 Kay Meyer requests that the following omission be included in the minutes: The increase in the president’s discretionary fund requested by Mark Chaves and granted by 2008 council was following upon the death of President Dean Hoge while in office.]

❖ Kay Meyer calls for a vote. All are in favor. None opposed. **Passes unanimously.**

Corwin Schmidt notes that we have increased the student research award from \$10,000-\$15,000 and the president’s discretionary budget from \$7,000-\$10,000. That is adding \$8,000 to the budget.

James Cavendish asks if there are any further questions. No questions. One comment is made by James Beckford. He gathers the endowment should be increasing and healthy, if his TIAA-CREF retirement fund is any indication.

❖ Kay Meyer calls that the council authorize the treasurer’s audit and approve the proposed 2011 budget – with amendments. All are in favor. None opposed. **Passes unanimously.**

### **JACK SHAND ENDOWMENT**

Art Farnsley initiates discussion. Based upon stipulations in the endowment, there is \$52,800 dispersible grant money available to allocate this year - this number should be on page 16, but is not. Council decides each year how much of this income to spend. In 2009, it was decided not to allocate any money for a large grant in 2009-2010. Money was allocated for travel grants and small research grants. Last year half of the money was allocated, because of concerns about the economy and consequently preserving the strength of the principal on the endowment. Art Farnsley states that what needs to be

decided during this council meeting is how much we allocate for the upcoming year. It is noted by Art Farnsley that the large grant is new and done only once, initiated by Mark Chaves. Additionally, according to the stipulations made by the endowment, the Jack Shand endowment cannot be used to fund graduate students in any way.

Stewart Hoover admits he, in light of the economic uncertainty of last year, was in strong favor of reserving the principal and therefore limiting the grant money. However, he is now in favor of spending the full \$52,800 and for being less “cautious” than he was last year.

Gerardo Marti would like to expand the international travel grant. He also makes an argument that more small grants will do us better than large grants because, in principal, it encourages more research and seed grants are useful for those wanting to begin new projects but do not have the resources at their universities or colleges to do so. Gerardo Marti further states that there should be higher limits on the small grants, something in the range of \$4,500. Corwin Schmidt implies that it would be useful if this money were somehow made accessible to graduate students. He asks whether faculty could be the principal investigators on the grants and oversee the projects of graduate students. Art Farnsley clearly states “No.” The endowment is very clear about for what and to whom the money can be allocated. Kay Meyer proposes that the money could be used to hire graduate assistants as a way to fund graduate students. Kay Meyer asks Art Farnsley if awardees spend the grant money. Art explains that awardees do not get any money until the meeting the following year, after the research is complete, and once receipts for the work are presented. Corwin Schmidt states that he is in favor of spending the whole amount and is sympathetic to “spreading the wealth” to multiple awardees.

*Motion: Corwin Schmidt motions to allocate the entire \$52,800 dispersible grant money available. Stewart Hoover seconds the motion.*

❖ Kay Meyer calls for a vote. All are in favor. None oppose. **Passes unanimously.**

#### **DISCUSSION RE: ALLOCATION OF THE \$52,800 JACK SHAND GRANT FUNDS**

Marie Cornwall introduces the idea of allocating a considerable amount to international travel, in support of James Beckford’s desire to fund non-North American meeting participants. Gerardo Marti is in favor of allocating a significant amount of the fund to small grants. James Beckford is in favor of small research grants as well because, in his view, big grants are “riskier.” Large grants could be reconsidered when the endowment is stronger. Corwin Schmidt inquires if there is a maximum amount on the small grants. Art Farnsley explains that the “rule of thumb” is \$3,000 grants, but the actual amounts of the grants are at the discretion of the small grant committee. Corwin Schmidt inquires next about whether in the past the pattern had been that good projects do not get funded or that there are not a good number of quality proposals. Gerardo Marti explains that while chair of the committee, there were many good, intriguing projects and that most projects funded did ultimately go on to become larger projects, although there were several applications where the projects were not deemed to be strong. In his year as chair, the committee allocated \$18,750 of grant money.

*Motion: Gerardo Marti moves that the council allocate \$15,000 to the international travel committee and \$37,800 to the research grant committee. James Cavendish seconds the motion.*

Discussion: Several council members state that the president, James Beckford, can encourage people to apply for the international grants. Korie Edwards ask for clarification regarding whether there is any actual policy stipulating limits on particular grant amounts, given that much of the discussion revolved around allocating funds for the purpose of expanding the number of small grants awarded. Art Farnsley says there is no policy. Stewart Hoover and Gerardo Marti interject that custom governs the amounts of the small grants. Korie Edwards clarifies that the council is therefore not voting on small grants or the amount of the actual grants but rather how much to allocate to committees and the committees will be making this decision. Stewart Hoover (and others) mention that the president can communicate the desire of council to increase the amounts of the small grants and that this can be noted in the call for grant proposals.

- ❖ Kay Meyer calls for vote on allocating \$15,000 to the international travel award committee and \$37,800 to the small research grants committee. All in favor. None opposed. **Passes unanimously.**

Fifteen minute break taken at 2:45 PM.

3:00 PM.

### **RELIGIOUS RESEARCH ASSOCIATION (RRA)**

Art Farnsley states that RRA is committed to provide \$5,000 to this year's meeting and \$5,000 to the 2011 meeting; and to commit \$2,000 in its annual budget to the SSSR/RRA annual meeting. John Bartkowski explains that he has been commissioned and he is committed to developing a memorandum institutionalizing this financial commitment.

### **JSSR EDITOR'S REPORT (MARIE CORNWALL)**

Marie Cornwall reviews the JSSR Editor's report, highlighting and bringing up for the discussion the following:

- In Table 2 of the JSSR Editor's report in the 2010 Council Packet, the 2010 acceptance rate is incorrect. It reads 24%. The correct acceptance rate is 13%.
- As of today, JSSR is ten manuscript submissions short of last year's total manuscript submissions. The turn around is lengthening slightly this year, but the turn around for a manuscript is very rarely over 100 days.

Gerardo Marti inquires about reasons for the increase in submissions. Marie Cornwall says she suspects this is largely the result of the electronic conversion. An attempt was made to increase the fee for submissions to \$35 for non-members. However, this has not made a significant impact on the number of submissions from what she can tell. Corwin Schmidt inquires if the increase is the result of a disproportionate increase in

graduate student submissions. Marie Cornwall notes that she has seen an increase in submissions by graduate students from religion -focused sociology departments and junior faculty. Marie Cornwall also suspects that the increase is due to increased advertising by Blackwell Publishers.

- The journal is currently working with Blackwell to celebrate the upcoming 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the journal. Blackwell is developing a new cover for the journal that will include a “50<sup>th</sup> anniversary” banner. An online issue will be created highlighting certain works from 2000 on. There will also be a special online issue which will include four solicited articles, each article discussing what a forward thinking social scientific research agenda looks like and where social scientists of religion should go from here. The four solicited contributors to the special 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary online issue are: Robert Wuthnow (sociology), Laura Olson (political science); Justin Barrett (psychology); Wendy Cadge (religious studies).
- Marie Cornwall and the JSSR staff are tracking citations and anticipate an increase in impact factor this year.
- The book review editor consistently produces 8 – 10 book reviews an issue. Rhys Williams suggests that the book review editor solicit book reviews.

### **PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE REPORTS**

The chair of the committee, Eileen Barker, is present to give the report. She reviews the very detailed report which is in the 2010 Council Packet regarding the selection of the JSSR editor, particularly in light of Marie Cornwall’s end of term approaching. In Eileen Barker’s review, she highlights certain points:

- It is difficult finding an institution as generous as Brigham Young University.
- A focused effort involving all relevant parties should be conducted to find applicants for the JSSR editorship.
- The process needs to be complete by this time next year at the very latest for the editor to begin in January 2012.
- Everyone should be involved in finding applicants.
- The possibility of multiple editors might be considered. It might be appropriate for this decision to be made by the incoming head editor(s).
- It appears that people no longer see this as a career step.
- Expand search beyond North America.
- Publishers vary in how much they want to contribute.
- Consider expanding eligibility for editorship.
- Decisions must be made regarding the maximum and minimum that the association will accept from the editor(s) and the host institution.
- There could be further discussion regarding the terms of the office.
- A general policy and plans could be developed that stipulate what the journal and its structure looks like.

Discussion: Art Farnsley asks whether the term of editors should begin in January 2012. Marie Cornwall responds explaining that she has done four volumes over five years. However, Manuscript Central makes processing easier. Manuscript Central also made the transfer of the editorship easier. Consequently, a March

start for the new editor is possible. During the editorship transfer from Rhys Williams to Marie Cornwall, Marie Cornwall began with reviewing only original submissions. Rhys Williams handled the still active R&Rs. In May of that year, Marie Cornwall began to take the R&Rs. James Beckford inquires about how overlapping editors affects the budget. Art Farnsley explains that a six month overlap was stipulated in the 2008 budget to accommodate the transition period where Marie Cornwall's editorship period overlapped with that of Rhys Williams. The 2011 council will make the decision regarding the 2012 budget and the budget to accommodate the next editorship transfer. Corwin Schmidt asks whether there is an advantage to having dual editors. Marie Cornwall responds explaining that there are several models for how editorship post(s) are structured. However, this should be and is typically up to the decision of the applicant(s). Kay Meyer concurs, and shares that *American Sociological Review*, which was recently at Ohio State, had two editors. The editors applied as dual editors. James Beckford inquires whether there has been discussion of departments/institutions with a core number of scholars who study religion. Marie Cornwall states that people at these institutions tend to be very research focused and productive. It is her guess that the next editor will come from a less research focused institution – given the time demands of an editorship. Corwin Schmidt inquires whether having graduate students is critical to running the journal. Marie Cornwall states that the current editorial assistant is a senior. The previous editorial assistant was a master's student. The job of the editorial assistant is to keep reviewers on schedule. In her view, with Manuscript Central, it is very doable to do this with capable undergraduate students. Rhys Williams – who explains that he was once strongly in favor of the journal only going to institutions with graduate students – now agrees that with Manuscript Central, it is very possible for the journal to be hosted at an institution that does not have a graduate program. Marie Cornwall then strongly encourages the council to seriously consider the recommendation made by the Publications Committee on page 36 of the 2010 Council Packet to arrange interviews with applicants during the period between May 2011 and August 2011. She arranged interviews on her own accord as an applicant, and found this process to be very helpful.

Kay Meyer calls for a vote on the Publications Report. All in favor. None opposed.

### **OTHER COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Kay Meyer briefly reviews the *Membership Committee Report*, noting that results of the report were incorporated to programming for the 2010 meeting.

Kay Meyer moves on to the *International Travel Awards Committee Report*. Art Farnsley highlights that the International Travel Awards Committee on page 54 of the 2010 Council Packet requests clarification on four guidelines – numbered 1, 2, 3, 4. Art Farnsley explains that the Jack Shand trust addresses points 1, 3, and 4. (i.e., applicants do need to be SSSR members; they cannot be ABD; and they must only hold a terminal degree) There is, therefore, no need for council to discuss points 1, 3, and 4. The only

point to clarify is point 2, regarding whether “the proposed presentation must be given in SSSR sessions or are RRA sessions acceptable.”

Discussion: There is inquiry about how this might affect organizing the program. Korie Edwards explains that she and Deborah Kapp worked in concert to organize the 2010 SSSR/RRA program. In an effort to develop a smoother program or to address scheduling concerns, they at times needed to move papers around from, for example, a SSSR session to an RRA session. Limitations, such as suggested by #2, may cause challenges to both the SSSR and RRA program chairs. Rhys Williams concurs and is not in favor of institutionalizing changes that inadvertently limit the ability of program chairs to arrange sessions. John Bartkowski also concurs.

***Council’s Response to the International Travel Award Committees inquiry regarding clarification on point #2 on page 54 of the 2010 Council Packet: Concerning request for guidelines, the 2010 Council finds that points 1, 3, 4 are answered by the trust. As for point #2, council generally agrees that ordinary cooperation between the two associations be taken into account. (i.e., the awardee can present in an RRA session).***

Art Farnsley briefly reviews the *Jack Shand Grant Committee Report*.

Art Farnsley also briefly reviews the *Student Travel Awards Committee* report. He then notes that the chair of the 2009-2010 committee did not get in contact with nor involve the two most recently appointed members of the committee in the award decisions. That is to say, the two new members did not participate in the decisions on the student travel awards. These two members will then be serving on the 2010-2011 committee since it constitutes the second year of their two year term.

Kay and Art briefly review the Jack Shand small grants, international travel grant, student travel and student research grants awarded (see pages 53-57 of the 2010 Council Packet). The awards and awardees will be posted on the association’s website.

Kay Meyer also briefly reviews the Distinguished Article and Book Award Committee reports. Kay Meyer inquires about the possibility of removing a line from the Distinguished Article Award report, which states that there were not “A+” papers submitted for consideration. The council did not seem to be in favor of “censoring” (as Rhys Williams put it) the reports of committees. Kay Meyer calls for acceptance of Mark Regnerus’ distinguished article award report. All are in favor of accepting report “as is.”

Kay Meyer would like to recommend the creation of a publicity committee, noting the challenges with publicity for the 2010 meetings. Corwin Schmidt nominates himself to head the publicity for next year’s meeting in Milwaukee, WI. No discussion around developing a standing publicity committee.

Korie Edwards reviews the *Program Chair Report*, hardcopies of which were handed out at the meeting. This report is not in the 2010 Council Packet. Korie Edwards highlights the following:

- Letters mailed out to local scholars and departments/institutions about the meetings. She is unsure of how this impacted attendance at the meeting.
- Discussed that the submissions and notifications timeline of the meetings was made earlier because the 2010 AAR meetings were scheduled at the same time as the 2010 SSSR/RRA meetings, something that does not generally occur. Early notification would hopefully encourage participants to attend the SSSR/RRA meeting.
- On-line system is very helpful but it does still have some bugs that need to be addressed.

Kay Meyer and Art Farnsley briefly review the Nominations Committee Report.

Kay Meyer calls for a vote on a general acceptance of all committee reports as listed in the 2010 Council Packet or addressed in anyway during the council meeting. All in favor. None opposed.

#### *SSSR Committee Members and Nominees 2010-2011*

James Beckford notes that, on page 64 of the 2010 Council Packet, under “Nominating Committee,” the Past-President should be Katherine Meyer, not James Beckford.

| *James Beckford motions that nominations for committee chairs and members listed on pages 62-64 of the 2010 Council Packet with amendment be approved. Motion is seconded by John Bartkowski.*

- ❖ Kay Meyer calls for a vote on the nominations. All in favor. None opposed. (Note that James Beckford did not participate in the vote as the preparer of the SSSR Committee Members and Nominees 2010-2011 report, per SSSR policy).

### **2011 SSSR MEETING**

James Beckford discusses his call for papers. For the meetings of 2011, he aims to focus on research done in other countries and how it is done; emphasize cross-disciplinary work at the 2011 SSSR meetings, possibly via panels; have global representation at the meetings. He would also like to facilitate an on-line conversation and networking opportunities for graduate students – or who he prefers to refer to as “new researchers.” Another aim is to have a special event highlighting JSSR at next year’s meeting.

James Beckford introduces Steve McMullin, the program chair for the 2011 SSSR Meetings.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

James Beckford: There are several editorial mistakes in the constitution. Should the constitution be reconsidered? Art Farnsley explains that for edits, a council consideration is not necessary.

*Kay Meyer motions for the meeting to be adjourned. Stewart Hoovers seconds the motion.*

❖ Kay Meyer calls for a vote. All in favor. None opposed.