

AGENDA
1st ASR 2017 COUNCIL MEETING
Saturday, August 11, 2018

4:00 – 8:00 p.m., Saturday, August 11, 2018
Sofitel Hotel, Bordeaux (2nd Floor)
Dinner served at 6:00 p.m.

2018 ASR President Daniel V.A. Olson presiding

- 1) Review of minutes from last year's ASR Council Meetings – Daniel V.A. Olson
- 2) Editor's Report – Gerardo Marti
 - a. SoR Editor transition
- 3) Publisher's Report – Patricia Thomas
- 4) Publication Committee's Report – Joy Charlton (no report)
- 5) President's Report – Daniel Olson
 - a. Discuss cancelation of Religion and White Supremacy Presidential Session
 - b. Discuss forming an ad hoc committee on sexual assault and harassment
- 6) Nominations Committee Report on the results of the 2018 ASR Elections – Michael Emerson (report?)
- 7) President Elect's and Incoming President Elect's report on 3-year committee appointments to ASR's Standing Committees – Paula Nesbitt and James Cavendish
- 8) 2019 Program Committee's announcement of the Call for Papers for next year's Annual Meeting in New York – Paula Nesbitt and Gabriel Acevedo
- 9) Executive Officer's Report – Rachel Kraus.
 - a. Discussion of website
 - b. Discuss social media arrangements with SSSR, RRA, and the ASA Religion Section
 - c. I continue to receive a small number of request regarding a "retired" category for membership.
 - d. Student member ad hoc committee? Proposed 2 years ago, was asked about this potential opportunity this year.
 - e. Move election end date earlier in because some travel arrangements are already made by June.
 - f. Insurance: for directors and officers? For general business liability?
- 10) Program Chair's Report – Jerry Park (report?)
- 11) Development/Finance Committee – James Cavendish (report?)
- 12) Membership Committee Report – Katie Corcoran
- 13) International Liaison Committee Report (the Gallagher Travel Grants) – Elisabeth Arweck
- 14) Fichter Award Committee Report – Dawne Moon
- 15) McNamara Student Paper Award Committee Report – Stuart Wright.
- 16) Distinguished Article Award Committee Report – Chaeyoon Lim
- 17) Lifetime Achievement Award Committee Report – Nancy Ammerman.
- 18) Upcoming meetings - Rachel

- a. 2019: Park Central New York
 - i. 8/11/19 (welcome reception; first council meeting - 8/14/19 (2nd council meeting)
 - ii. ASA: 8/10/19 – 8/13/19; Religion Section day 2 (8/11/19)
 - iii. Room rates are \$185 for a single, \$205 for a double, @20 for each additional guest
- b. 2020: San Francisco Hotel Nikko
 - i. 8/7/20 (welcome reception; first council meeting) – 8/10/20 (2nd council meeting)
 - ii. ASA: 8/8/20-8/11/20; Religion Section day 3 (8/10/20)
 - iii. \$279 for all room types
- c. 2021: Chicago, TBD
- d. TBD – We do not know ASA’s revised section rotation. Should discuss in spring
- e. ASA: 8/7/21-8/10/21

19) New Business

20) Adjournment

Respectfully Submitted,

Rachel Kraus, ASR Executive Officer

Association of Sociology of Religion, 1st Council Meeting Minutes

August 12, 2017

4:00-8:00 pm

Intercontinental Hotel, Montreal, Quebec

Present: Lori Beaman, Michael Emerson, Daniel Olson, Paula Nesbitt, Rachel Kraus, Di Di, Jerry Park, Gerardo Marti, Milagros Pena, Mary Ellen Konieczny, Lisa Pearce, Ruth Braunstein, Inger Furseth, Solange Lefebvre, Jean Beaman, Trish Thomas, Suzanne Macaluso

Michael Emmerson welcomes the group and calls the meeting to order at 4:16 pm.

Introductions around the room.

Review of last year minutes: name spelling correction. Motion to approve from Lori Beaman, second from Lisa. Minutes approved with corrections unanimously.

Lori Beaman: Reports on the nominations committee. No serious issues were raised in the process. The winners and all council members are printed inside the program. Paula Nesbitt was elected as President-Elect. The voting members and the newly elected council members are Elizabeth Arweck, Jualynne Dodson, and Solange Lefebvre.

Appreciation was expressed for those cycling off council: Richard Flory, Giuseppe Giordan, Milagros Pena.

Dan Olson – President Elect’s report:

- Change to the by-laws in when the members of standing committees are nominated so he asked one person from a few committees to continue for an extra year.
- Discusses the theme for the 2018 conference, encourages reaching outside of the sociology of religion and inviting scholars from outside of the discipline to participate in a series of “presidential sessions.” Inviting sessions – ideas for topics from a subfield that would be relevant should be sent to Dan and Jerry Park (Program Chair). He also asked for ideas for a Furfey Lecturer for 2018. Look to the Call For Papers for more information. Ideas for potential speakers were given, Dan will send an e-mail to council asking for names.
- We will not have a joint ASA/ASR session next year due to the timing of the call. Lori Beaman adds how difficult it is to coordinate with the ASA for the joint sessions.
- Discussion about waivers on the membership and conference registration for participants in the presidential sessions. Rachel Kraus gives some financial context, 4 or 5 waivers in registration would not be monetary problem. Need to give thought to how those decisions are made. We could treat the presidential sessions like the ASA/ASR joint sessions in which we do not require additional registration for ASA attendees.

Discussion of waivers for registration, should the exceptions be made on a case by case basis through a conversation between the president-elect, program chair, and executive officer. No dissent.

Rachel Kraus – EO report:

- Announcement about drink tickets – color coded for the three different receptions
- New for this year – ribbons identifying the leadership of the ASR
- ASR meet and greet at the business meeting, please try to attend if at all possible on Monday morning.
- Information on website frustrations. Experiencing a lot of difficulties. The webmaster has said that our site is quite outdated. Discussion of changing webmasters.
 - o \$5000 to \$8000 to get our website up to “code”
 - o Vote to approve up to \$8000 to make the changes to the website. Motion is made and seconded, unanimous approval.
- New membership fee structure has been implemented. Discussion of a “retired” category, recommendation from the finance committee is that with the change to different income level options will help with this issue and no other changes need to be made.
- Discussion of membership/registration fee waivers. Helpful to have the nonmember price/option published. Current policy is that everyone on the program must be a member.
 - o Motion to include a nonmember conference registration option for those on the program who are invited to participate in author meets critic sessions.
 - o Passes unanimously
- Raising registration fees, last year approved by council but does not go into effect until 2018. Philly, NY, and SF coming up and they are more expensive conference cities. Discussion of when to implement the registration fees.
 - o Motion to implement the raise originally approved for 2017 in 2018 and in 2019 implement the raise originally approved for 2018.
 - o Passes unanimously
- Current nonmember registration fee is now lower than the fees just approved.
 - o Motion to raise the nonmember fee to keep the same differential.
 - o Passes unanimously
- Discussion of hotel room costs and bookings. This year many bookings were cancelled at the last minute.
- Finance committee recommendation to pay registration and renew membership at the same time.
- QuickBooks discussion. Rachel has found it helpful for organizing and maintaining clearer financial records.
 - o Motion to approve the yearly subscription to QuickBooks.
 - o Passed unanimously
- Discussion of the 2018 budget.
 - o Motion to approve the 2018 budget
 - o Passed unanimously

Jean Beaman – International liaison committee

- Should the Gallagher Travel Grants be awarded separately? International scholars v. students? International scholars regularly ask to use the funds for airfare rather than hotel nights. Clarify the language in the call online.
- Tax advantage to awarding room nights rather than cash.
- Motion to approve the proposed language change to the Gallagher award as proposed by the committee: International scholars (award in hotel room nights + up to \$500 cash) and graduate students (award up to 3 ASR hotel room nights)
 - o Friendly amendment to add the 3 nights passes
 - o Motion passes

Di Di – Program Chair

- Overview of the program report.
- Changed time slots to better fit with ASA but we don't have the long lunch time slot. Moved the business meeting to the morning.
- Concern over the number of author meets critics sections.
 - o Should this be up to the program chair?
 - o Limit the length of time after publication of the book? 2 years?
- Difficulty with paper proposals being differentiated by the online system.
- No problems getting conveners.

Gerardo Marti – SoR Editor Highlights

- Commitment to bring on more international board members, still a challenge to find scholars who are rigorous enough in their review and willing to commit.
- Associate Editor to focus on dissemination and publicize an author's work.
- Efficiency of decision making has added to the value of the journal
- Site SoR in your work, particularly the last year 😊

Michael Emerson – special thanks to Gerardo for his work

Trish Thomas – Publisher's Report

- Circulation trends
- Trend toward online only
- If people want data on subscriptions, contact Trish

Michael Emerson

- Fichter Award Committee – discussion on capping the proposals to \$5000
 - o Motion to approve, passes
- Distinguished article award – make the name of the award consistent with the spirit of the award
 - o Proposed change to “The Distinguished Sociology of Religion Journal Article Award”, motion and passes
- Lifetime Achievement Award
 - o Discussion of ASR covering some expenses
 - o Motion to cover travel expenses (airfare + 2 nights hotel, in addition to the current \$500)
 - Passes

To discuss at the New Council meeting:

- 2020 dates to be decided at New Council meeting
- Preliminary discussion of what to include for the ASR lifetime achievement award
- ASR Social Media
 - o Should this be a paid position?
 - o Give it an official title that someone could put on their CV
 - o Associate Program Chair for Social Media
- Posting pictures on the website – put a disclaimer when people register for the conference

Editor's Report August 2017– August 2018
Sociology of Religion: A Quarterly Review

August 1, 2018

Prepared by: Gerardo Martí (Davidson College)

I. Editor, Book Review Editor, Associate Editors, and Editorial Board (Institution/Date term ends)

Editor in Chief:

Gerardo Martí (Davidson College/December 2020)

Book Review Editor:

Grace Yukich (Quinnipiac University/December 2020)

Associate Editors:

Kevin Dougherty (Baylor University/December 2020)

Penny Edgell (University of Minnesota/December 2020)

Daniel A. Winchester (Purdue University/December 2020)

Editorial Board Members:

Gabriel Acevedo (The University of Texas at San Antonio/December 2019)

Gary Adler (Pennsylvania State University/December 2019)

Nancy Ammerman (Boston University/December 2020)

Elisabeth Arweck (University of Warwick/December 2018)

Joseph O. Baker (East Tennessee State University/December 2021)

John Bartkowski, University of Texas at San Antonio (December 2020)

Kraig Beyerlein (University of Notre Dame/December 2018)

Alex Bierman (University of Calgary/December 2020)

Ruth Braunstein (University of Connecticut/December 2019)

Kelsey Burke (University of Nebraska, Lincoln/December 2019)

Philip Brenner (University of Massachusetts, Boston/December 2018)

Louise Cainkar (Marquette University/December 2019)

Nanlai Cao (Remin University of China/December 2018)

James Cavendish (University of South Florida/August 2018)

Michael D. Driessen (John Cabot University/December 2019)

Michael Emerson (Rice University/August 2020)

Anna Halafoff (Deakin University Australia/December 2018)

Jonathan Hill (Calvin College/December 2020)

John Hoffmann (Brigham Young University/December 2021)

Amy Jonason (Furman University/December 2021)

Mary Ellen Koniczny (University of Notre Dame/December 2021)

Rachel Kraus (Ball State University/August 2020)

Lene Kühle (Aarhus University/December 2018)

Dawne Moon (Marquette University/December 2021)

Olaf Müller (University of Münster/December 2021)

Agata S. Nalborczyk (University of Warsaw/December 2018)

John O'Brien (New York University, Abu Dhabi/December 2018)

Michal Pagis (Bar Ilan University/December 2018)

Rachel Rinaldo, (University of Colorado (December 2020)

Philip Schwadel (University of Nebraska, Lincoln/December 2018)

Jasjit Singh (University of Leeds/December 2018)

Jenny Trinitapoli (University of Chicago/December 2020)

Iddo Tavory (New York University/December 2019)
Jeremy Uecker (Baylor University/December 2020)
R. Stephen Warner (University of Illinois, Chicago/December 2020)

Associate Editors: The continuing Associate Editors—Penny, Kevin, and Dan—have been truly outstanding in their readiness to work quickly, the thoroughness and care of their judgments, and their thoughtful feedback on the broader issues in managing the journal. In addition, Dan is to be thanked for his service is generating great attention for our work and greatly expanding the many efforts for promotion and dissemination I had begun three years ago. While I expect to evaluate the workings of this new role throughout my term, I am still convinced of the value of Dan’s role and hope that future editors will continue to dedicate an associate editor for dissemination and promotion of our publications a high priority—even if the nature of the tasks require to accomplish this role will likely change in the future.

Book Review Editor: Grace continues to be outstanding in her role for the journal. In addition to “regular” reviews, Grace has been soliciting “featured book reviews” that are longer and more substantive. The featured essay differs from a typical book review in two ways: 1) they are slightly longer (2000-2500 words), and 2) rather than following the typical summary/evaluation format that focuses solely on the book’s content, the essay reflects on the state of related theory and research and how the book contributes to those areas of knowledge (e.g. more like a review essay in *Contemporary Sociology*, but focused on a single book rather than several). Grace and I are open to your feedback on these featured review essays. I am extremely happy with their depth and hope they become the “new normal.”

Editorial Board: More than any other qualities, the willingness to respond quickly and provide detailed reviews and recommendations for other reviewers are most appreciated from Editorial Board members, and the board members continue to be responsive and helpful. Over my time of service, I have recruited many new board members. In general, I strive to recruit board members who have already demonstrated excellence in reviewing for the journal; in particular, I seek reviewers who are timely in responding to invitations, timely in turning in reviews, and whose reviews indicate detail, rigor, and careful reading of manuscripts. I am especially interested in recruiting scholars that diversify institutional representation and compliment the expertise of the existing board. I also seek to balance quantitative and qualitative methodological expertise, to include a broad range of research specialties, to consider diversity in the length of tenure in their scholarship, as well as consider other issues like gender balance and geographic breadth. I consistently draw on scholars well beyond my own circle of relationships. I do still find that international scholars who would provide timely, thorough, rigorous, and sociologically-relevant reviews are a challenge to locate or to gain commitment. I continue making an effort to stagger invitations of new members to more evenly spread the terms of board members. To that effort – and as I had planned – I will allow about ten current members to complete their terms and will be recruiting about ten more board members whose terms would begin in January 2019, therefore their term would expire December 2022.

ASR Executive Officer: Rachel Kraus, continues to deserve high praise for her gracious and responsive work in relation to the journal and to the varied and important issues related to my editorship. The role of Executive Officer involves largely unseen service to the journal, and Rachel’s work over the past year is very much appreciated.

Publisher Relationships: OUP staff has become more transparent about their production processes and the communication between myself and OUP has been very good. They are very attentive to me and Grace, and they worked hard to maintain confidence in the production process. In comparison with last year, OUP transitioned our journal to a new typesetter, and the accuracy and efficiency has greatly improved. I am grateful to Trish Thomas and Sarah Cooper, as well as Gina Ferrago and our new production editor, Jack Cassidy, who were the people most involved in working with me (and Grace) to ensuring the smooth rhythm of production processes. Note that Michael Blong has just become our publisher contact with OUP as Trish Thomas transitions to other internal responsibilities.

Also, in the interest of finding ways to maintain and possibly build our Impact Factor, I accelerated the production schedule by three weeks in 2018, making the appearance of articles three weeks earlier than before. Effectively, the Autumn issue should release just before our annual ASR meetings and the Winter issue should be released while students and faculty are still in classes, which means they may be able to refer to the journal for writing they accomplish during the Winter break. It gives more time for attention to be drawn to articles in the journal, hopefully resulting in more citations earlier. It also will help compensate for unexpected delays in publishing the issue, as occurred this year when transitions between Cenveo and Newgen resulted in an issue being released early January rather than late December. Finally, as I look at the schedule for this year, I am strongly inclined to further accelerate the schedule by another week or two.

II. Manuscript Flow

The journal continues to be highly selective in accepting manuscripts. In 2017-2018 there was an increase in overall submissions from the previous year, which is in line with general expectations. However, while *original* submissions increased, the number of *revised* submissions has slightly decreased. Also, generally speaking I have tried to restrain the number of second “Revise and Resubmits.”

Moreover, the overall selectivity of the journal remains very high, with an acceptance rate of **16.6%**. I view this slight increase in acceptance rate (from 11.7% last year, and 8.3% the previous year) as positive, especially since very low acceptance rates could discourage potential authors from submitting.

Overall, the slight decrease in submissions alongside a slight increase in acceptance rate indicates two things: 1) submitted manuscripts are better suited to the mission of the journal, and 2) the quality of the manuscripts is generally higher.

- 175 manuscripts in total (new and revised submissions) were processed on or after August 1, 2017. The total for the previous year was 154 (previous was 174, the year before 230, and the year before that was 170, and previous before that was 145). This is a 14% increase over last year yet well within the “middle” range of submissions during my tenure.
- 133 original (new) manuscripts with a submission date on or after August 1, 2017—an increase of 23 from the previous year (21% decrease).
 - Of the 128 that have editorial decisions, 97 were rejected (76%, a slightly lower percentage compared to 78% last year, yet well within “normal”), 26 were given “major revision” status (20%, up from 15% last year, yet generally within “normal”), and 5 were given “minor revision” status (4%, slightly down from 6% last year). No manuscripts were accepted outright this year.
- 42 revised manuscripts with a submission date on or after August 1, 2016—a decrease of 2 from the previous year. This may indicate a slightly lower number of authors with minor or conditional acceptances.
 - Of the 41 revised manuscripts that have decisions: 22 were accepted (54%, same as last year), 3 were given “major revision” status—that is, a second “major revision” (7% up from 2%), 13 were given “minor revision” status (32%, down from 40% last year), and 3 were rejected (7%, slightly up from 5% last year).
- Of all manuscripts that received an editorial decision on or after August 1, 2017, **12.4% (22/177) were accepted** (this includes the Furfey Lecture and Presidential Address), slightly down from 16.6% last year.

III. Time from Submission to Editorial Decision

Every year, I write how I have given my responsibilities with the journal top priority, and I devote nearly daily time to editorship of the journal. I believe it is not possible to process manuscripts faster. In addition, I continue to find that any significant lag times are due to waiting for reviewers to respond to invitations and to turn in their evaluation of manuscripts. These times are unlikely to grow shorter, rather they might increase—at least slightly. I continue to reach out to scholars who are not part of usual circles, and I continue to expand the reviewer database with scholars whose expertise would benefit the journal. I have also been a bit more patient in waiting for scholars to respond to invitations (they now receive 3 separate emails for any manuscript invitation) and for evaluations (up to 4 weeks past the overdue date).

Overall, I am pleased to report that decision times continue to be very fast, and the great majority of decisions on all manuscripts are made within three months. In very few unusual cases, the wait times for decisions have been longer; however, it is difficult to fully assess how much this is balanced by the rapid rejection of inappropriate submissions (i.e., *desk rejections*) and how much these decisions “throw off” the averages. By whatever angle I assess it, the evidence suggests that the time between submission and decision remains remarkably efficient. Also, anecdotal evidence suggests that active scholars have been motivated to submit to the journal in part due to their understanding that the management of manuscripts is highly efficient. Indeed, I consider the efficient times from submission to editorial decision a significant

and continuing achievement of my editorship – especially since I still typically assign four reviewers per original manuscript, and the quality of the reviewers assigned is typically very high.

- Among new submissions, all editorial decisions were sent back to authors within 4 to 12 weeks of the submission date.
 - Rejected manuscripts (aside from inappropriate submissions which are rejected very quickly) averaged 24 days from submission date to editorial decision date. This compares to 28 days last year, 30 days previous, 23 days previous to that, and 33 days the previous year before that.
 - “Major revision” decisions averaged 49 days from submission date to decision (compares to 52 days last year, 66 days previous year, 49 days previous to that, and 51 days the previous year before that).
 - “Minor revision” decisions averaged 20 days (compares to 31 days last year, 105 days previous year, and 50 days the previous year before that). The difference is likely due to variation that comes with consulting with Associate Editors on manuscript decisions.
- Among revised submissions,
 - “Accepted” decisions average 14 days (compared to 6 days last year, 9 days previous year, and 1 day the previous year to that) from submission to decision. This slight increase, however, conceals a bifurcated distribution with few in-between times; more specifically, the broad number averages longer times (64 days) and very short times (2 days). I have been less likely to provide opportunities to “finalize” the manuscript, which in the past has lead to very quick acceptances of a 2nd R&R. Still, even with longer times, many manuscripts receive very quick decisions based on minor revisions or offers of conditional acceptance.
 - “Minor revision” (a 2nd R&R or “conditional acceptance”) decisions average lag is 41 days (compared to 38 days last year, 39 days previous year, 25 days the previous year, and 56 days the previous year before that).
 - “Major revision” decisions (a 2nd R&R) average time to decision is 17 days (compared to 28 days last year, 42 days previous year, 6 days the previous year, and 38 days the previous year before that).
 - “Reject” decisions average lag is 48 days (compared to 37 days last year, 31 days previous year, 47 days the previous to that and 58 days the previous year before that).
- The time from acceptance to publication online in Advance Access remains approximately 4 – 5 weeks; from Advance Access to print has lengthened slightly to roughly 3 - 8 months. With the acceptance rate being as low as it is, I have been accepting manuscripts knowing that they may sit as an Advanced Access article for longer periods than in the past. As long as wait times to print are less than 12 months, I believe this is acceptable and may indeed be advantageous in allowing citations for articles before they appear in print – which directly benefits our Impact Factor.

IV. Impact Factor

Summary of Impact: The impact factor went up again this past year from 1.370 to 1.556. This again continues SOR meeting or surpassing the "1.0" level on the impact factor rating for a sixth year. (To provide a familiar point of comparison, JSSR stagnated at 1.09 vs 1.097 and RRR moved from up from .585 to .776 during this same period.) Also, The 5-year Impact Factor is now 2.0, a significant increase (compare with JSSR 1.794 and RRR .951), The impact factor of SOR remains **highly favorable in relation to our comparison journals**.

SOR ranks 52 out of 143 in Impact Factor in the Sociology journals category of the ISI rankings. (In comparison, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* ranks 77 out of 143 in Impact Factor in the same rankings.) The 5-year Impact Factor of 2.0 ranks Sociology of Religion 46 out of 143 sociology journals. (Last year, the 5-year impact factor was 1.614, ranking 46 out of 143 sociology journals.)

Like previous editors, I am committed to do what I can to see that the increase in visibility and impact continues. For example, I strongly endorsed the electronic distribution of TOC and Advance Access Articles to all ASR Members because the sooner others are aware of newly published scholarship, the sooner they will be cited. I thank Rachel Kraus for regularly including links to SOR’s most recent issue of the journal in our email announcements.

I am especially appreciative of OUP’s marketing team for working to allow and promote more “Free Articles” as well as widely promote recent publications through the Twitter feeds, as well as inviting authors to submit blog posts to their

widely read site that draw more attention to their article and, consequently, to our journal. Associate Editor Dan Winchester has been diligent in keeping up a steady flow of attention through social media.

I very much appreciate the new (and good) work of our Associate Editor, Daniel Winchester. I remind you that this role was created in 2017 to disseminate newly published work of the journal. Dan has taken over my own work previous to this by devoting exclusive time to partner with OUP and authors in widely promoting new articles. Dan also agreed to start up a “Sociology of Religion Podcast” with authors of recent articles, an experiment in finding new ways to draw attention to our most recent articles. As anticipated, we are seeing the benefits to the Impact Factor in 2018.

Other initiatives to promote visibility (and citation) this past year include:

- More frequent rotation of “Free Articles” of recent publications from the journal on our OUP home page
- Working with OUP’s marketing to promote the journal and specific articles through their many electronic venues, in addition to “Advance Access” and banner features
- Special features of papers and collections of papers through OUP’s twitter and blog pages.
- Calls for Papers for Special Topics (last year’s invited essays published in 74.4 and this year’s “Dissertations in Progress”; this year’s to be published soon “Does Social Theory Need Religion?”)
- As of May 2016, regularly publishing a Twitter feed of recently published articles @SORJournal
- As of October 2017, a regular production of the Sociology of Religion Podcast, featuring interviews with authors of recently published articles.
- Associate Editor Dan Winchester working with authors directly to promote their work broadly in partnership with OUP.

More detail:

Sociology of Religion:

The 2017 (latest) impact factor is 1.556

2009 = .56
2010 = .91
2011 = .86
2012 = 1.08
2013 = 1.667
2014 = 1.00
2015 = 1.217
2016 = 1.370

Comparison with JSSR:

The 2017 (latest) impact factor is 1.097

2009 = .92
2010 = 1.34
2011 = 1.34
2012 = 1.39
2013 = 1.15
2014 = .958
2015 = 1.231
2016 = 1.09

Comparison with RRR:

The 2017 (latest) impact factor is .776

2009 = .29
2010 = .47
2011 = .45
2012 = .34
2013 = .50
2014 = .406
2015 = .414

2016 = .585

V. Final Considerations

Impact factor and the number of articles per issue: We typically publish 18-20 articles per year, a figure that does not include Featured Book Reviews, Book Reviews, or ASR Announcements. Our annual page budgets from OUP will not allow more than what we are doing now. However, if the number of articles continues to expand in Advance Access in the coming months, I will publish an additional article or two per issue to avoid excessive lag times from acceptance to publication in a paginated issue. The caution regarding adding more articles per issue is to avoid placing excessive burden on the Impact Factor (since each article adds to the need to have articles cited at a higher number). I caution any future editors to limit additional articles without some consideration of the effect on the Impact Factor.

Of course, I am happy to have sustained a strong Impact Factor because I believe that it generates pride in authors who successfully publish and therefore promote their work and that it seems to encourage higher quality submissions. However, everyone should be cautioned that the Impact Factor cannot be predicted or controlled. A “dip” could happen, even when editorial practices have been consistent.

Everyone associated with the journal is encouraged to actively CITE journal articles published in the previous year in their own journal articles. My motto: CITE EARLY, CITE OFTEN.

OUP production lags: As I reported last year, OUP staff has worked hard to put the issues of the journal on schedule and open up communication with me as editor. I continue to be attentive (even aggressive) in making sure OUP remains true to their commitment to restore confidence in what had been a smooth process. Production processes have improved greatly, and, aside with a delay in the Winter 2017 issue, my anticipation is to have a smooth work process in place this coming year.

Despite production problems, I am generally pleased with the quality of the journal, and I am glad to see the mix of topics, methodologies, and author seniority in submissions. In addition, I am especially pleased with the full editorial team in place as I believe it bodes well for the longer term of the journal.

ASR Board Planning for Editorial Transition: As I complete my second term as Editor in Chief, it is now time for the ASR Board and Publications Committee to enact a process for transitioning my role. It has been the practice of the journal to have the first year of the new editor overlap a last “transition” year by the Editor – which means that 2020 would be an “apprentice year” involving both the outgoing editor remaining “on the clock” while the new, incoming editor “learns the ropes.” The practice of apprenticeship of the last two editors (at least) has been essential for the incoming editor to understand the technical workings of Manuscript Central, the publishing relationships with OUP, the recruiting of a new editorial team (Associate Editors, Book Review Editor, and new Editorial Board Members), and the ability to adjust and anticipate the many less obvious tasks and issues that arise in leading the journal.

With respect to a timeline, I suggest the following:

January – February 2019: Publications Committee construct Call for SOR Editor

March – May 2019: Recruit and Receive Applications

June – August 2019: Evaluate and Select Incoming Editor

September – November 2019: Invitation and Negotiation

December 2019: Announce Editor-Elect for 2020

January - March 2020: Editor-Elect Establish Editorial Team

April – December 2020: Orientation, Training, and Apprenticeship of Editor-Elect with Outgoing Editor

January 2021 – December 2023: New Editor Term of Service

I plan to encourage several people to apply and hope you all will too. In the meantime, I continue to welcome your feedback.

President's Report
Association for the Sociology of Religion
August 2018

Rachel Kraus, our capable Executive Officer, informed me that past presidents of ASR have tended to write short reports or no reports. Thus, I am also going to keep this fairly short.

Rachel indicated that these reports typically have mentioned things along the lines of “if I had only known,” or “if I had it to do over again I would have instead done . . .” These kinds of ruminations are intended to help incoming presidents and the Council avoid future problems. I don't have much to say of this sort that I didn't already discuss in my Incoming President's report last year.

Last year I mentioned that we experienced difficulties working with ASA to have joint ASA-ASR sponsored sessions. The main difficulty was that ASA moved up its deadlines for receiving session descriptions and I missed that deadline. This year ASA moved the deadline up even further to almost two years in advance. Fortunately, Paula Nesbitt was able to accommodate that schedule and (last Fall of 2017) submitted a session description for the August 2019 conference. So, I believe that next year we will have a joint ASA-ASR session. Therefore, I want to warn Jim Cavendish that he may need to prepare a session for Fall of 2020 by sometime this fall.

As you may recall, since we have no joint ASA-ASR session this year, we implemented a replacement strategy where Jerry Park, the program chair, and I organized several “Presidential Sessions” in which we invited people from outside the discipline of sociology to interact in panels with sociologists of religion to talk about ways in which their work might inform the work of sociologists of religion and vice versa. Indeed, the idea of these sessions was to implement the conference theme of “Strengthening Weak Ties to other Sociological Subdisciplines.”

In keeping with this conference theme, I invited Jennifer Glass from the University of Texas at Austin, to be this year's Furfey Lecturer. I chose Professor Glass because, even though her main research area is in Family, a significant portion of that work seriously engages the topic of religion and the ways that religious subcultures and beliefs, particularly conservative Protestantism, impacts a broad range of topics in her subfield of family studies. In other words, I think she is well-positioned to talk about ways that religion variables can inform research outside the sociology of religion and vice-versa.

There are some other issues to discuss, but those appear elsewhere on the agenda.

I want to thank you for the honor of serving as your Association President this year. I know I leave the organization in good hands with our President-Elect, Paula Nesbitt.

Dan Olson
President, Association for the Sociology of Religion

ASR President-elect Report

August 1, 2018

Philadelphia, PA

Paula Nesbitt

The primary activity for the 2017-18 year has focused on thematic development of the 2019 annual meeting program, proposing joint ASA-ASR sessions, and issuing a Call for Papers. The theme, Engaging Religion in a Contested Age, seeks to engage common or traditional frameworks with new or cutting-edge approaches across a range of fields within the sociology of religion. Although many current contestations in political life don't directly cleave along religious lines, an important field of exploration has to do with whether religion may have played a direct or indirect role or may have become a presenting target to masquerade other underlying issues. The topic also lends itself to a discussion of international trends.

The 2019 annual meeting will feature two ASA-ASR joint sessions. The ASR theme coincides well with the 2019 ASA theme "Engaging Social Justice for a Better World." Four joint sessions were proposed, but the ASA Program Committee liaison reported that two sessions were not accepted "based on the number of sessions already anticipated related to the same content." The sessions accepted are:

"Religion and Contested Understandings of Social Justice," organized by Richard Wood, University of New Mexico. Presenters are Mansoor Moaddel, University of Maryland; Ruth Braunstein, University of Connecticut; Jose Casanova, Georgetown University; Bryan Massengale, Fordham University.

"Religion and Contested Understandings of Gender and Sexuality," organized by J.E. Sumerau, University of Tampa. Presenters are Dawne Moon, Marquette University; Lain A.B. Mathers, University of Illinois, Chicago; Kelsy Burke, University of Nebraska-Lincoln; Nik Lampe, University of Central Florida.

The timeline for proposing joint sessions has become a matter that needs urgent attention in the early fall. Last year, the formal proposal letter requesting joint sessions and accompanying rationale was due in early November. The approval process moved slowly, although amicably. Although this timeline can be workable, it takes foresight and early planning by the President-elect and Program Chair. In addition to session topics and titles, including sufficient description and rationale, it also would be a good idea to include session participants and presentation titles, as these may be helpful in discerning whether a session overlaps other sessions that the Program Committee is anticipating. This information will be needed by January anyway, if not earlier.

Presidential panels are envisioned to address four of the key thematic topics listed in the Call for Papers. An experimental feature of the 2019 program Call for Papers is the salon discussion. This is intended to be an interactive session involving a convenor who introduces a focus question and accompanying context for open discussion among attendees. The discussions, somewhat like a roundtable, are anticipated to draw a small number of attendees who are interested in a given topic. Anyone proposing a salon discussion should anticipate at least one or two colleagues who plan to attend. The number of salon sessions and their placement would depend upon availability in the overall program.

Looking ahead to the 2019 program, priorities include helping scholars new to ASR get to meet and know others, mentoring or professional development for junior scholars and students, and building scholarly discussion across international contexts.

As a second item, Rachel had requested that officers keep track of responsibilities and reflect on approaches that worked well or not, with the objective of developing a common document for future holders of the office. To that end, I've attached a *draft* President-elect Checklist, which may be useful and easy to revise as needed.

Call for Papers
81st Annual Meeting of the
Association for the Sociology of Religion

Location: New York, NY
Hotel: Park Central Hotel New York, 870 Seventh Ave.
Date: August 11 (welcome reception) – August 13
Program Chair: Holly Folk, Western Washington University

Theme: Engaging Religion in a Contested Age

Within the sociological study of religion, many religious beliefs and practices have been challenged by the fluidity of taken-for-granted definitions and boundaries. Categories or concepts such as gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, rights, liberty, autonomy, identity, culture, tolerance, and even religion itself have become contested terrain that religious groups and their surrounding societies now must negotiate, especially where migration and cross-cultural relations have challenged assumptions and practices. Recent political strife over how knowledge is constructed, legitimated, and appropriated for social action, including popular disputes over what is authentic or authoritative, have brought into public discourse additional contestations that may affect religious groups in varying ways.

How do religious groups respond or not to the varied contestations that arise, either internally or in relation to their surrounding society? Alternatively, how might religion serve as a resource for analyzing, understanding, and addressing contemporary issues or contestations in local or transnational societies?

The 2019 annual meeting's thematic sessions will focus on several key topics and sites of contestation:

- Religion and contested understandings of gender and sexuality
- Religious movements and contested understandings of just societies
- Contested understandings of race, ethnicity, and religiocultural identity
- Contested understandings of religiosity and secularity, and the utility of these concepts
- Contested theoretical frameworks for understanding and studying religion

Papers and discussion sessions may be thematic or they may focus on any other topic within the sociology of religion. Those that invite comparative, cross-cultural, theoretical, methodological, or pedagogical considerations are especially encouraged. Author meets critic, teaching and professional development, and salon discussion (on a focus question) sessions are also welcome.

DEADLINES:

- Session proposals: March 31, 2019
- Paper abstract submissions: April 30, 2019
- IMPORTANT NOTE: All session and abstract submissions should be made through the ASR website at www.sociologyofreligion.com.

Membership in the ASR is required for organizing or convening a session, presenting a paper, serving as a panelist, or holding another role in the program. All are expected to register for the meeting by July 1, 2019. Panelists participating in joint ASA/ASR sessions are expected to be a member of either association. Joint ASA/ASR session panelists are expected to register for the ASR meeting if they are part of the ASR program in any other role. For questions, contact Holly Folk (holly.folk@wwu.edu), Paula Nesbitt (pnesbitt@gtu.edu), or Rachel Kraus (ASREO@bsu.edu).

Notes

Having conceptual overview and thematic direction identified ahead of the annual meeting in the year elected will allow for maximum contact with colleagues and others during the meeting for discussing and refining the direction, theme, and other matters that one might hope to put in place.

Working with the ASA Program Committee for joint sessions needs to begin very early, including marketing the proposed sessions in relation to the ASA programmatic theme if possible.

ASR EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

TO: Officers, Members of Council of the Association for the Sociology of Religion

FROM: Rachel Kraus, Executive Officer

RE: Report on the State of ASR

What I've been working on this past year:

- 1) Contracted with a new webmaster:
 - Working on a new membership and registration system along with cosmetic updates of the websites.
 - o Implementing new membership system and forcing payment.
 - o Automatic update current memberships and automatic update/display registration status. Membership renewals would be automatically sent and membership would expire based on the day someone registers rather than Dec. 31 for everyone
- 2) Working with a media partnership between the EOs/Directions of SSSR, RRA, and the Religion Section of the ASA
 - Increased social media visibility via twitter and Facebook. Our journal and association are represented frequently. I've also increased my Twitter activity that I only use for ASR related news
- 3) Site visits
 - I completed our New York and San Francisco site visits, so we have hotel contracts through 2020.
 - I will not complete any site visits in the year of 20218 because the ASA is changing their section rotation and they won't have that figured out until Spring of 2019. I will contract Council when I have that information and we can start site visit discussions over email.

I am happy to report that I have secured very competitive rates for both our 2019 and 2020 meetings.

- a. 2019: Park Central New York, doors away from one of the ASA hotels
 - i. Aug. 11 (welcome reception; first council meeting – Aug. 14 (2nd council meeting)
 - ii. ASA: Aug. 10 – 13; Religion Section day 2 (Aug. 11)
 - iii. \$185 for a king and \$205 for a double room for our entire room block
- b. 2020: San Francisco Hotel Nikko, around the corner from ASA hotel
 - i. Aug 7 (welcome reception; first council meeting) – Aug. 10 (2nd council meeting)
 - ii. ASA: Aug. 8 – 11; Religion Section day 3 (Aug. 10)

- iii. \$279/night for king or double bed rooms
- c. 2021, Chicago, TBA
 - i. TBA depending on ASA section rotation?
 - ii. ASA: Aug. 7 – 10; Religion Section day 4??????
 - iii. **ACTION ITEM: DO WE WANT TO WAIT FOR ASA TO DECIDE THE SESSION ROTATION FOR 2021 BEFORE WE START LOOKING AT HOTEL?**

Jerry Park, our Program Chair and our President, Daniel Olson, have put together an excellent program. We will have 6-7 concurrent sessions in the same time slot. In a break from last year, the timing of our sessions is not completely based on the ASA schedule. We needed to alter our time blocks in order to make room for special events 1) Mary Ellen's memorial and a business lunch around noon.

Many other aspects of the association continue to flourish. *Sociology of Religion* continues to climb in the rankings. Congratulations to Gerardo for his tremendous service as the journal's editor.

This year's committee reports are a testament to each committee's hard work to make their operations more efficient and identify areas in need of improvement. There is not one committee whose work has not been stellar.

Regarding our membership: As of July 25, 2017, we have 318 active professional members and 140 active student/low income members for a total of 458 members (We had 587 members at the time of the ASR conference last year). Unfortunately, this number reflects a slight decline from our membership numbers in past years that ranged from the low to the mid 600s. However, the general trend for membership in the ASA Religion Section and the SSSR in recent trend has also been one of slight decline. So although it's not ideal for our membership numbers to be slipping, the trend we are seeing is on par with other associations.

The Finance Committee (or what our Constitution calls the "Development Committee") developed a plan for a new membership fee structure and increase in registration rates. We implemented the new membership fee structure and we raised registration rates for our 2018 meeting. This plan corresponds nicely to the increasing costs of our 2018, 2019, and no doubt, our 2020 meetings. The new membership fee structure that was implemented this year is as follows:

ONE YEAR PROFESSIONAL

- \$60 (annual salary less than \$50,000)
- \$70 (annual salary between \$50,001-\$75,000)
- \$80 (annual salary between \$75,001-\$100,000)
- \$90 (annual salary more than \$100,000)

TWO YEAR PROFESSIONAL

- \$105 (annual salary less than \$50,000)
- \$130 (annual salary between \$50,001-\$75,000)
- \$155 (annual salary between \$75,001-\$100,000)
- \$175 (annual salary more than \$100,000)

STUDENT/LOW-INCOME COUNTRY RESIDENT

- \$20

Council also approved a three-year membership option. However, there weren't enough available categories in our PayPal account that would allow for additional categories. I talked with our webmaster and we should be able to implement the three year option (he's currently working on a lot of changes with our membership system). The three year professional membership categories approved by council are as follows:

- \$145 (annual salary less than \$50,000)
- \$185 (annual salary between \$50,001-\$75,000)
- \$230 (annual salary between \$75,001-\$100,000)
- \$260 (annual salary more than \$100,000)

There were a few retired faculty members who asked if we had an option for retirees. I discussed this question with the Finance Committee, and we concluded that people in retirement will have different incomes, so they can place themselves in whatever category best fits their income. For retirees who were looking for less expensive option, I did offer them a three-year membership at the lowest Professional Member price (pointing out that per year, our rate is lower than the current annual ASA retiree membership fee of \$50).

Regarding the raising of registration fees: Council approved a two-year tier in registration fee increases. The approved registration fee increase is as follows:

CATEGORY	2018	2019
Students	40	50
All Others	95	140

So, what does the financial status of ASR look like at the current time? ASR's assets at the current time are summarized below:

<i>Banking Accounts</i>	<i>Value as of 8/9/18</i>
ASR's Checking Account at Forum Credit Union	107,734
ASR's Savings Account at Forum Credit Union	1.80
PayPal Account	3,132
Total Value of Banking Accounts	\$110,868
<i>American Funds Accounts</i>	<i>Value as of 6/30/17</i>
Washington Mutual Investors Fund-A (Fund #01)	133,475
The Bond Fund of America-A (Fund #08)	105,190
American High-Income Trust-A (Fund #21)	115,803

Capital World Grown and Income Fund-A (Fund #33)	123,057
SMALLCAP World Fund-A (Fund #35)	140,875
American Funds Money Market Fund-A (Fund #59)	11,337
Total Value of American Funds Portfolio	\$629,737
TOTAL ASSETS	\$740,605

The Association is in very good financial shape. In large measure, this financial stability is due to the interest we earn on our investments, our cost savings in member services through the use of our website instead of regular, postage-paid mailings for dues mailings, ballot mailings, etc., and the revenue that is generated from our journal. Unfortunately, at the writing of this report, our room block did not make, so we will post likely have to pay some attrition fees (hopefully no more than \$2,000). I'm not sure what the reason is for our lower number of room block bookings. When I developed the contract with the Sofitel, I put a lower number of rooms in our room block. I also sent out several reminders via email and Twitter about staying at the Sofitel and how it means supporting our association. Also, I believe it was Inger (my apologies if I'm not remembering correctly) who posted an announcement on the religion association list serve to which she belongs. So, I don't believe the problem was due to lack of effort on our part. I also offered to make people's reservations for them so all they had to do was to tell me the nights they wanted to stay. Our hotel event manager, Jennifer was fantastic in assisting with these reservations. It's possible that Philadelphia is a less desirable city to visit. It's also possible that our distance from the ASA (about ¾ of a mile) discouraged some of our members from staying with us (we couldn't get closer to the ASA due to Philadelphia hotels that can accommodate our needs were mostly booked up for the time we would be in Philadelphia.

Without a doubt, the most important item in this report is my sincere thanks to Jim Cavendish for his consistent and frequent assistance with the EO transition. I continue to be grateful for Jim's patience, dedication to the ASR, and his sincere desire to see our association thrive. Furthermore, I thank Jerry Park, our Program Chair, and Dan Olson, our President, for their continued commitment to the association and deep desire to put together a thought-engaging conference. I very much appreciate Tia Pratt's willingness to serve as our secretary during this transition year before we formally elect a Secretary during our next election. I am also very grateful to our Council Members, Committee Chairs, and Committee Members. Without their hard work and dedication, the conference and the work of the ASR would not be possible. Thanks so much!

	2013 New York	2014 San Fran	2015 Chicago	2016 Seattle	2017 Montreal	2018 Philly to date and projected	2019 New York Proposal
<i>Contributions, Gifts Total</i>	16,454	17,905	19,766	23,023	34,691	30,000	30,000
Memberships	16,454	15,906	19,050	23,023	32,891	30,000	30,000
Donations; Unused Fichter		2,000	716		1,800		
<i>Program Service Revenue Total</i>	76,385	88,393	86,181	70,320	90,901	94,311	92,711
Publications Total	63,508	63,163	70,231	52,354	71,707	71,411	71,411
Journal submission fee					742	600	600
Processing Fees	200						
Oxford Royalties	50,000	51,652	52,864	50,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
Oxford Stipend for Editor	10,000	10,000	10,000		15,000	15,000	15,000
Brill Royalties			5,882	1,187	412	412	412
EBSCO Royalties					99	185	185
Cengage					131	130	130
Copyright Clearance					84	84	84
Springer					239		
Non-Oxford Royalties	3,308	1,511	1,485	1,167			
Annual Meeting Total	12,877	25,230	15,950	17,966	19,194	22,900	21,300
Registrations (incl breakfast)	10,177	20,930	11,600	12,547	12,944	16,000	18,000
Book Exhibits	1,300	1,000	1,150	1,719	1,050	1,100	1,100
Program Ads	400	600	400	200	200	200	200
OUP Co-sponsor Reception	500	500	500	500	1,000	1,000	1,000
Brill Co-sponsor Reception	500	1,000	1,000	1,000	2,000	1,000	1,000
Louisville Instit. Co-sponsor Reception				2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Other Reception Sponsors		1,200	1,000			1,300 (memorial)	
Session Sponsors			300				
<i>Investment Income Total (dividends, interest)</i>	22,244	29,865	25,247	19,317	83,594	10,000	15,000
Total Revenue/Income	115,083	136,163	131,194	112,660	174,495	134,311	137,711

<u>Expenses</u>							
<i>Grants Total</i>	24,552	20,151	19,688	16,121	17,500	21,780	20,500
McNamara	918	500	500	500	500	500	500
SoR Article		500	500	500	500	500	500
Lifetime Achievement					500	500	500
Gallagher	4,971	1,529	3,489	3,250	3000	5,280 (24 room nights)	6,000
Fichter	17,633	16,622	15,199	11,871	12,000	14,000	12,000
Furfey	1,000	1,000			1,000	1,000	1,000
<i>Salary/Stipends Total</i>	20,250	23,500	21,500	24,000	31,500	33,500	33,500
Executive Officer	10,000	7,500	7,500	7,500	12,000	12,000	12,000
EO Course Buyout					3,500	3,500	3,500
Executive Officer Office Help		2,000				2,000	2,000
Soc of Relig Editor	7,500	10,000	10,000	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500
SoR Book Review Editor	2,750	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
<i>Other Expenses Total</i>	92,128	71,219	60,175	66,962	72,812	85,611	77,094
Management/Website Total	6,100				4,851	5,000	3,000
Office Total	2,973	1,948	2,056	1,707	1,420	4,444	4,394
Constant Contact					480 (40/mo)	540 (45/mo)	540 (45/mo)
Wordpress					200	200	200
Quickbooks					331/year	425/year	425/year
American Express Fee					179	179	179
Articles of Incorp. Renew					50	50	50
Office Expenses/Supplies		1,623	1,581	1,269	125	250 (new PayPal reader)	200
Consulting Fees		325	475	438	54.50	300	300
Social Media Partnership						2,500	2,500
Travel Total/EO Site Select	2,500	1,705	611	2,309	1,581 (NY and SF)	0	1,000
Conference/Ann Meet Total	56,666	44,587	35,667	47,641	39,590	52,657	65,820
AV	12,095	1,027	3,744	1,896	1,925	7,000	7,000
AV Shipment			303	1,167	3,153	1,000	1,000

Food and Beverage	34,116	32,667	22,159	34,093	21,822	30,000	40,000
Room Costs (Officers, Program Chair, Furfey)		5,232	3,889	3,964	6,004	6,000	6,000
Registration workers	925	895	1,718	1,260	760	1,000	1,000
Furfey dinner					396	400	400
Awards					113	120	120
Name tags, ribbons					228	200	200
Standard supplies	125	239	223	110	198	100	100
Program Assistant	2,230	195				1,000	1,000
Program Printing	1,510	849	581	1,094	758	1,000	1,000
Meet Travel Reimburse	5,665	3,483	3,050	4,057			
President					771	500	600
President - Elect					500	500	600
EO					647	500	600
Furfey					457	5,000	600
Journal Editor					830	337	600
Program Chair					257	500	600
Future Program Chair					771	500	600
Other Journal Expenses Total	23,889	22,979	21,841	15,305	24,703	22,880	22,880
Payment to OUP for member subscriptions	18,889	18,889	16,796	15,225	17,380	16,500	16,500
Editor's Budget	5,000	3,524	4,545		2,500	5,000	5,000
Reimburse Editor's Expenses (journal related gatherings at annual meeting)		566	500	80	815	500	500
RSO							
Apple computer for editor					3,341		
Depreciation Total				667	667	630	600
Total Expenses	136,930	114,870	101,363	107,083	121,812	141,521	131,094
Total Income	115,083	136,163	131,194	112,660	174,495	134,311	137,711
Total Income - Expenses	-21,847	21,293	29,831	5,577	52,583	-7,216	6,617

PREVIOUS YEARS' BUDGETS AND PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 2018

ASSOCIATION FOR THE SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION

2018 Notes:

- Book exhibits:
 - Scholars Choice: 2 tables
 - Brill: 3 tables
 - Spring: 1 unstaffed table
 - OUP: 2 tables
 - NYU: 1 unstaffed table
- Program Ad: Berghahn Books
- Expenses, Supplies: We purchased a new laptop for Gerardo's SoR editorial work. I estimated another \$200 for paper, toner, etc. used at Ball State. I purchased an updated PayPal card reader for under \$100. Some meeting supplies were paid for using AmEx points on Amazon.
- AV: Costs are much greater in Philadelphia compared to Montreal. I did not ship our screens since they are old and aren't able to be shipped back and forth. Some AV is required for hotel union contracts. Hotel AV services were hired to help set up and dismantle our AV equipment, prepare the room for two speakers (including use of hotel speakers and microphone for optimal sound quality), and a tech on-site to help trouble shoot any AV issues that may arise during the conference.
- Consulting fees: I consultant with my personal accountant to assist with the budget and taxes. I've already spoken with him about whether he can assist me with our type of organization. He has other clients like us. I've also consulted with other people in positions like mine for technical assistance with formatting the program.
- Travel expenses for officers and others is an estimate based on current information.
- Social media partnership: In 2018, we entered in a social media partnership with the SSSR, RRA, and the ASA religion section to help promote the work of an announcements relating to the ASR.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rachel Kraus

To: Rachel Kraus, ASR Executive Officer

ASR Council

From: Dawne Moon, Chair, Joseph H. Fichter Award Committee

30 May 2018

The Fichter Committee consisted of three members: myself, Cathy Holtmann, and Tanice Foltz. We received 23 applications this year, roughly the same as last year, and were able to award \$14,000 to four recipients:

- \$4000 to Rafaella Taylor-Seymour (PhD Candidate, U. Chicago) for “Being Gay and Pentecostal: Conflicted Moral Experience in Zimbabwe”
- \$4000 to Holly Folk (Assoc. Prof., Western Washington U.) for “Could God Become a Woman? Female Messianism in New Christian Religions: Intersectional Politics, Organizing, and Religious Activism of U.S. and British Muslim Women”
- \$3000 to Christine Cusak (PhD Candidate, University of Ottawa) for “Disenchantment and transition among mainstream Mormon women: Understanding non-religious identity construction and organized unbelief”
- \$3000 to Maro Youssef (PhD Candidate, UT Austin) for “‘Doing Democracy’ in The Muslim World: How Women’s Groups in Tunisia Construct Democracy”

(See attached spreadsheet for complete details).

ASR seems to be successful at embracing scholars in areas beyond North American Protestantism. A considerable number of projects addressed Mormonism and Islam, and several were global in scope or focused on other parts of the world, with a considerable number of proposals addressed countries or communities in African countries. I was also happy to see that many of the proposals focused on the processes of defining/producing gender and/or sexuality rather than treating it as a variable, and examined the global south, as called for by Avishai, Jafar, and Rinaldo (2015)

We employed the mercifully efficient process I learned from last year’s chair, Richard Pitt. In this process, each committee member rated each application (1-5 with 1 as highest) on three criteria of their choosing; these criteria were reported to me, and then each applicant’s score was taken as an average of all nine scores (three scores from each of three reviewers). This method balanced an efficient use of reviewers’ time while allowing room for the subjective criteria for which we were recruited to the committee.

As the spreadsheet reveals, there was considerable consistency among the reviewers’ assessments of each candidates. Only one proposal received widely divergent evaluations. In that case, since my evaluation was high and another committee member’s was low, I asked her about it and she gave me her reasons, which I conceded.

Several years ago when I was on this committee, I was informed of an effort on the part of ASR to be a truly international organization and to encourage international research and the participation of international scholars. This effort seems to have paid off, particularly in the number of proposals from scholars based in African countries. However, it occurred to me when reviewing the applications that different countries may have different conventions for grant applications. It might serve future applicants, and the committee, well if ASR could provide a more specific template for grant proposals, so that projects may be more easily compared ensuring that substance is not overshadowed by stylistic differences in grant distribution.

International Liaison/Gallagher Grants Committee Report 2018

26 July 2018

To: Officers, Members of the Council of the Association for the Sociology of Religion

From: Elisabeth Arweck, Chair

Re: Report to Council on the Activity of the International Liaison/Gallagher Grants Committee for 2018

The Committee

The International Liaison Committee was comprised this year of

- Jean Beaman (Purdue University)
- Nazanin Shahrokni (Syracuse University)
- Elisabeth Arweck (University of Warwick, UK)

Background

The main task of the International Liaison/Gallagher Grants Committee is to provide suggestions for selecting the international scholars and graduate students who receive the Ralph A. Gallagher Travel Grants (total amount of \$6000).

For applications in 2018, there were separate arrangements for graduate students and international scholars:

- international scholars could apply for up to \$500 to be used towards airfare and 3 nights in the ASR conference hotel
- graduate students could apply for up to 3 nights in the ASR conference hotel.

Similar to previous years, the steer from the Council was to award fewer grants in larger amounts so that applicants would be more likely to receive sufficient funding to enable them actually to attend the conference.

To allow the Committee to make an informed choice among candidates, applicants were required to submit a single document, including:

- + their CV
- + an extended abstract to the ASR conference of 1000-1500 words
- + a statement of financial need
- + evidence that they could attend the meeting, should they receive an award.

In addition, applicants were asked to state their specific requests regarding the number of room nights for which they were applying and the specific amount of money (up to \$500) for which they were applying, to be used towards airfare (for international applicants).

The call indicated that

- = applications would be evaluated based on the quality and contribution of the papers
- = applications from graduate students needing to travel a farther distance would be prioritised;
- = applications from international scholars with a research and publication record would be prioritised.

The Committee also took into account whether applicants had presented their cases in the required way, in other words, did they include all the documents and were the documents in the required shape/length.

The Committee's Experience in 2018

To encourage submissions from international applicants, the call was advertised in the usual ways: through the listservs and social media outlets of related organisations, including the European Sociological Association Sociology of Religion Research Network and the ASA Religion Section.

The Committee received 15 applications. Of these,

- 12 had met the deadline of 15 April
- 1 did not meet the deadline, technically speaking, but was given the benefit of the doubt (after some consultation, also with the Executive Officer), given time zones (see also below)
- 2 were received well past the deadline and were thus not accepted.

The total of 13 applicants means that 3 more applications had been received this year than in 2017. Of these 13 applications, 8 came from domestic graduate students and 5 from international scholars. The geographical spread of the international applicants was, similar to 2017, wide, including New Zealand, Nigeria, North Korea, South Africa, and the UK.

The Committee shared the application files among themselves as e-mail attachments.

The Committee members first considered and ranked the international scholars and graduate students separately/independently of each other, then shared their rankings.

Taking into account the criteria cited above and after a brief discussion, the Committee made the following recommendations:

- = not everybody who applied this year can be offered funds this year
- = award 3 of the international scholars the amount that they had requested (2 x \$750 and \$500)
- = award 1 of the international scholars who had not stated a requested amount the sum of \$750
- = award 1 of the graduate students the amount requested (\$750)
- = award 5 of the graduate students who had applied \$500, which would cover two hotel nights

Recommendations

Similar to last year, the Committee's work proceeded smoothly and quickly, once the committee's membership was clarified (see also below).

In the light of this year's committee experience, we make the following recommendations:

- = to continue with the separate calls for graduate students and international scholars
- = to clarify the categories of 'graduate students' and 'international scholars' so that the former is understood as graduate students located in the US and the latter is understood as applicants from outside the US, which may include established scholars and graduate students (this is how the Committee dealt with applications this year)
- = to make it clear in the call that applicants whose applications do not include the requested documents in the required format or length will not be considered (the Committee was not strict about this this year)
- = for the call to specify the relevant time zone(s) for the deadline in order to avoid future issues with 'late' applications

= for the call to include an indication of when applicants are likely to be notified about the outcome; the need of this has arisen for international scholars who are keen to book flights as early as possible in order to keep costs down

= to keep the details about this Committee on the ASR web site as up to date as possible (see also below)

Notes re 'Best Practice'

As the chair of this Committee rotates every year, Committee members have to learn the role of chair very quickly. Support from the previous chairs is therefore vital.

The new chair needs to know who the new member is who joins the committee. (There was some confusion this year, as the details on the web site were not up to date. This caused a bit, but not significant delay for the Committee's work.) An e-mail from the Executive Officer to Committee members about the new composition as soon as this is known would remedy this.

Once the chair has received all the applications, s/he needs to screen them and then send them to the other Committee members, pointing out things they may need to consider/take into account.

A clear indication about the criteria that guide the ranking needs to be communicated to and 'taken on board' by, especially new members, also in the light of any recent developments. (As chair, I have sought to do this when communicating with the other Committee members.)

In this chair's experience, Committee members tend not to be far apart in their respective rankings. Therefore, reaching recommendations regarding the allocation of the funds tends to proceed in a fairly smooth way. An initial steer from the chair is helpful in starting the conversation.

The chair needs to give a clear indication to the other Committee members when s/he expects their rankings.

Where Committee members differ, discussion by e-mail has so far resolved matters quite quickly. This means that Committee members need to be responsive so that the deadline for recommendations can be met.

Submitted by

Elisabeth Arweck
Chair, International Liaison/Gallagher Grants Committee
University of Warwick
Centre for Education Studies
Coventry, UK
elisabeth.arweck@warwick.ac.uk

2018 McNamara Student Paper Award Committee Report

Stuart A. Wright (Chair), Sabrina Danielson, Suzie Macaluso

The McNamara award committee received 19 submissions from 20 authors. One of the submissions was disqualified because the coauthor was a faculty member, not a graduate student. The guidelines for the award as posted on the ASR website are as follows: "Authors (and co-authors, in the case of co-authored submissions) must be members of the Association for the Sociology of Religion and *currently enrolled graduate students who have not defended their doctoral dissertation at the time their paper is submitted*" (emphasis mine).

Each submission was reviewed by the three committee members. The committee members were tasked with selecting their top 4 candidates. The short list of each of the committee members was submitted (in no particular order) and is shown below:

<u>C.member #1</u>	<u>C.member #2</u>	<u>C.member #3</u>
Glassman	Glassman	Abelhadi
Darwin	Darwin	Darwin
Horowitz	McPhail	McPhail
Chacko	Chacko	Brauer

Helana Darwin was the only nominee who appeared on all three ballots. Moreover, two committee members had her ranked #1 and the other #2. So after deliberation and by consensus of the committee, the award was given to Helana Darwin, "Redoing Gender, Redoing Religion," (published in *Gender & Society* 2018, 20 (2):1-23).

Submitted by Stuart A. Wright
ASR Chair, McNamara Student Paper Award Committee

To: Rachel Kraus, ASR Executive Officer & the ASR Council

From: Dawne Moon, Chair, Joseph H. Fichter Award Committee

30 May 2018

The Fichter Committee consisted of three members: myself, Cathy Holtmann, and Tanice Foltz. We received 23 applications this year, roughly the same as last year, and were able to award \$14,000 to four recipients:

- \$4000 to Rafaella Taylor-Seymour (PhD Candidate, U. Chicago) for “Being Gay and Pentecostal: Conflicted Moral Experience in Zimbabwe”
- \$4000 to Holly Folk (Assoc. Prof., Western Washington U.) for “Could God Become a Woman? Female Messianism in New Christian Religions: Intersectional Politics, Organizing, and Religious Activism of U.S. and British Muslim Women”
- \$3000 to Christine Cusak (PhD Candidate, University of Ottawa) for “Disenchantment and transition among mainstream Mormon women: Understanding non-religious identity construction and organized unbelief”
- \$3000 to Maro Youssef (PhD Candidate, UT Austin) for “‘Doing Democracy’ in The Muslim World: How Women’s Groups in Tunisia Construct Democracy”

(See attached spreadsheet for complete details).

ASR seems to be successful at embracing scholars in areas beyond North American Protestantism. A considerable number of projects addressed Mormonism and Islam, and several were global in scope or focused on other parts of the world, with a considerable number of proposals addressed countries or communities in African countries. I was also happy to see that many of the proposals focused on the processes of defining/producing gender and/or sexuality rather than treating it as a variable, and examined the global south, as called for by Avishai, Jafar, and Rinaldo (2015)

We employed the mercifully efficient process I learned from last year’s chair, Richard Pitt. In this process, each committee member rated each application (1-5 with 1 as highest) on three criteria of their choosing; these criteria were reported to me, and then each applicant’s score was taken as an average of all nine scores (three scores from each of three reviewers). This method balanced an efficient use of reviewers’ time while allowing room for the subjective criteria for which we were recruited to the committee.

As the spreadsheet reveals, there was considerable consistency among the reviewers’ assessments of each candidates. Only one proposal received widely divergent evaluations. In that case, since my evaluation was high and another committee member’s was low, I asked her about it and she gave me her reasons, which I conceded.

Several years ago when I was on this committee, I was informed of an effort on the part of ASR to be a truly international organization and to encourage international research and the participation of international scholars. This effort seems to have paid off, particularly in the number of proposals from scholars based in African countries. However, it occurred to me when reviewing the applications that different countries may have different conventions for grant applications. It might serve future applicants, and the committee, well if ASR could provide a more specific template for grant proposals, so that projects may be more easily compared ensuring that substance is not overshadowed by stylistic differences in grant distribution.