

Association of Sociology of Religion, Council Meeting Minutes
August 19, 2016
4:00-8:00 pm
Renaissance Seattle Hotel, Seattle, WA

4:11 Michael Emerson calls the meeting to order.

Introductions around the room

Review of last year minutes: Jim talks about the ASR council meeting overlapping with the ASA meeting. ASR typically meets two days before the ASA religion section. The year that Jeremy U. was the Program Chair, there was no overlap so council decided it would be good to overlap. When the ASA religion section is early, we would meet after the ASA religion section. So in Philadelphia we will meet the two days after the ASA religion section since it is earlier. The problem with this is higher room rates in Philadelphia.

A motion and seconded to approve the minutes. Unanimous approval.

The nominations committee reported on the 2016 election. The winners and all council members are printed inside the program. The voting members and the newly elected council members: Ruth Braunstein, Gladys Ganiel, and Kevin McElmurry. Appreciation was expressed for those cycling off of council: Chris Bader, Evelyn Bush, and Michael Emerson.

Michael E: Describes the standing committee process and reads the list of newly appointed members of standing committee.

Melissa Wilde: People are usually happy to serve so the nominations committee doesn't really have a problem finding volunteers. But, they need to decide how to move forward with the slate of candidates.

Some committees have four people on them. There is some preference for committees to only have three members in order to break a tie.

Michael E. talks about the next meeting and the theme of religion and division. Di Di is the next Program Chair. There is some discussion about joint ASR-ASA meetings. The ASA almost always agrees to our joint sessions. The questions was asked whether joint sessions are worth it. People who participate in these sessions have to register for both ASA and ASR unless the joint session is their ONLY involvement in one of the conferences. Melissa W. said when she was President, it wasn't a problem. She asked people if they were planning on attending the meetings anyway, and people were typically honored to be asked. Ryan Cragun reported that the organization of the joint sessions can be challenging and a lot of work. Also, the ASA doesn't do much to help with the organization. Jim C. points out that joint sessions are typically well attended, which gives the ASR some visibility. Gerardo Marti suggests we keep the joint sessions because it helps to legitimate the study of religion and showcases the ASR. Dan Olson plans to continue the joint sessions.

Mike E: He is putting together an ad hoc committee to create a short report on funding sources for the sociological study of religion. Campaign promise to form an ad hoc committee to put together a list of funding opportunities for religion. He asked for potential names from council: Chris Smith, Fengagng Yang, Penny Edgell, Mark Chaves, Vern Benson, and Kory Edwards, were some names mentioned, among others.

Jim C: He discusses the bylaw change that the president elect will nominate the new member of each standing committee and that person would be Chair the year of the presidential year. The newly appointed members are listed inside the cover of the program with (2019) after their names. The parentheses is the year their term will expire. This process should clean up the nomination process.

- Achievements this past year:
 - o New contract with Oxford University Press. We need to go through a renewal process every 4-5 years. We solicited proposals from other possible publishers. Just doing that pushed Oxford to provide more to us: higher stipend, \$55,000 minimum guaranteed royalty payment a year, contributing \$1,000 rather than \$500 toward the annual meeting, and adding a provision for saving money to those who opt out of receiving a hard

- copy. The more people opt out of a hard copy of the journal, the more ASR saves. Publishers want things online because it makes the publishers money with clicks. This works for articles, but not books.
- We renewed the contract with Gerardo Marti as editor of *Sociology of Religion*.
 - We are in a really good spot with contract renewals so Rachel Kraus doesn't have to do much. But we will need to look at contract renewals toward the end of her term.
 - Jim distributed a spreadsheet with the budget over email. We have been running in the black for a number of years. We are drawing a little more from the investment accounts than what we want according to our investment spending policy. Jim will talk with the financial advisor and ask them to decrease the amount that we draw from the American funds account. There's no reason we need to draw as much from the American funds account. The association is in good financial condition with over \$600,000 in assets. If we continue to spend wisely, we may be able to reach \$1 million, which is good for an association like ours to aim for. It creates more interest that can be used on grants and eliminates management fees associated with the accounts. Melissa asked how far away the million-dollar mark is. Jim says the development committee can work on actively asking for ASR donations, especially from retired people who may be happy to make a contribution. A few years ago Kevin Dougherty proposed a way to make the conference self-sustaining. Our membership/registration is modest compared to other organizations. Currently we only make gradations based on student/faculty. Michael E. asked if we could just raise every level \$10 and let people know we are attempting to reach a goal to make the meetings self-sustaining. The sentiment was expressed that members that are in transitional stage shouldn't necessarily pay the higher rate. Perhaps we should have a transition category and/or a retired category. Jim asked for a motion. Gabriel says membership numbers are declining, this would add to declining membership. Gabriel says all of them are downward trends. Gerardo says that even in the ASA sections, not just religion, trends are down. We draw a little over 4% from our American Funds account, which is recommended by our advisor and that is in or spending policy. We have not raised the fees in at least 6-7 years. Melissa W. moved we include non-tenure track faculty in low income and raise each category by \$10. We have some members who are not academics. The concern was expressed about graduate student perception that we are doubling their fees. PayPal takes a cut so we actually get less revenue.
 - Motion: development committee comes up with a proposal about how many years it's going to take to reach \$1 million. Seconded. Melisa asked about a financial hardship category. Response that it's really not needed—people assume they have to contribute something. SSSR has the same rates. Jim says we can make votes by email if we want something implemented the year from now. Jim says you can justify the raise of rates regardless and to let the development committee come up with a rationale. Louisville donated \$2,000 to this year's meeting to sponsor a reception to make themselves more visible. We will introduce Don Richter this evening. He is available to talk with people who are interested in Louisville institute grant opportunities. We may want to talk to LI reps in the future about continuing to support the conference. We may want to ask PEW, ARDA, and book publishers of ASR members who may want to have a book exhibit and/or co-sponsor receptions.
 - Motion to development committee to come up with a rationale for raising rates. We want to vote on it before November so any changes can be implemented before our notices go out to renew memberships. Moved and seconded. The motion passes unanimously.
 - Jim C. announces that we also have a new editor for the Religion and Social Order series, and she will be introduced at the Presidential Reception. She is Norwegian, which is appropriate since the series draws scholars from different countries.

Ryan Cragun reports on this year's meeting:

- Last year there were 5 sessions per time slot, and this year, we have 7. This means we have 20 more sessions this year compared to last year. We have more author meets critic and joint sessions.
- Michael E. asked if attendance at sessions would be low given the number of sessions. He asked whether we wanted to put a cap on the number of sessions we have on a program. This year, we have around 240 people registered for the meeting. Less than half reserved a room at the conference hotel. Other organizations make it a requirement but Jim doesn't know if it's typical. Many graduate students don't stay at our hotel. Maybe we can negotiate a lower student rate. Jim is happy with the number of registrants. Over 200 is great. He printed 190 programs, which save

about \$400-500 since some people opted out of receiving a printed program. There was a strong sense that being on the program is an opportunity to present and we don't want to change that. The idea was expressed to ask people in neighboring universities of the state to spread the word about the conference. Perhaps we could reach out to non-academics? Some desire was expressed to diversify the program. SSSP has critical dialogue tables.

- Managing the joint session was a pain but maybe that was partly due to the transition.
- Maybe ask council members to serve as a convener. There was a general sentiment in the room that council members would be willing to serve as conveners.

Gerardo Marti:

- He has received good responsiveness to his requests to review submitted manuscripts
- A few things to point out:
 - o He expanded the editorial board quite a bit with the addition of members beyond the US and Canada. It is a particular challenge to find quality reviewers outside of North America.
 - o Overall, manuscript submissions are down. He is not concerned because last year they were up a tremendous amount.
 - o The acceptance rate was 8.3%, which may be good for selectivity, but being so selective may mean that people are less willing to submit to the journal. This year, the acceptance rate is at 11.7% and he sees that as positive. Perhaps people won't view the journal as too unreasonable.
 - o He has been focusing on two objectives: 1) being more selective with revise and resubmits. 2) resisting second R and Rs. He prefers to adhere to one R send R and make a decision. Sometimes it may mean a 3rd or 4th review to get clarity or break ties to overcome a weak review.
 - o Impact factor increased from last year: 1.0 to 1.27 from last year, which compares favorably to other journals. JSSR is 1.23. Pleased with this. No way to control high impact factor and how quickly a new article gets cited. Books are not counted. He recommends to cite early and cite often to help the impact factor.
 - o OUP has done well to make our journal public and known. We include articles in news and announcements. OU has a steady rotation of free articles. What is selected as a free article gets high visibility.
 - o Kevin, Penny, and Rebecca agreed to continue in their various positions. Thanks to all of them for their work.
 - o There has been a lag of production of this last issue (77.2). OUP changed the typesetter. The process had been smooth, but now some things have gotten dropped and fumbling on technicalities. His opinion is that OUP should have anticipated the problem and the consequences of those problems. During the past six to seven weeks and interacting with various levels of OUP, there have been problems. Rebecca has had some difficulties as well. He has received assurance that OUP understands what has been going on and are working through those kinks. We still do not have a concrete date for when the July issue will be out. It may be another week. He just received the full pagination of the issue yesterday. Issue 77.3 should be on target. There are consequences for authors, and the news and announcements are no longer relevant. Could also affect impact factor. When articles are not available to be cited, the impact factor is lower. OUP says they will make an extra effort to make the journal even more visible.
 - o He's pleased with what we published and the reviewers. He gets 3-5 reviews per submission. He says the quality of the reviews are much higher this year. Authors are grateful for substantive commentary on reviews, even when their paper isn't accepted.
 - o On a few occasion he disagrees with reviewers. There is rarely a tie, but when there is, he sends it to an associate editor or a board member and that person's feedback weighs more heavily.

6:00 dinner break

Melissa Wilde reports on the publications committee:

- Four publishers were willing to talk to us. Everyone dropped out but Routledge who offered us 150% more than Oxford. Publications decided to stay with Oxford. Netting us twice what we were getting. Action item that we need to solicit proposals for publishers for the journal.
- Nothing on the agenda for this year. We have an editor for Brill and renewed the contract with Oxford.
- Melissa moved that we always solicit proposals rather than automatic renewal. We lost out of 3 years of revenue by automatic renewing. 2017-2021 is our contract with Oxford. Milly seconded the motion. Publications committee

consider 2 years prior to the contract because Oxford needs 1 year if we choose not to go with them. Gerardo says there are technicalities like reviewer lists that when you move to a new system.

- Michael called a vote that the publications committee charged with soliciting proposals. Passes unanimously.

Trish Thomas (liaison to Oxford)

- Number 2 issue comes out at end of August. They didn't have staff, responsiveness or quality control in place. They are monitoring the situation on a daily basis. OU was not good at anticipating or highlighting the problems so it came as a surprise and they take responsibility. They can't do anything about the #2 issue and all efforts to go to getting #3 issue back on track. Issue #4 should be fine.
- Publishers report: There is a migration to online subscriptions across the board and libraries. Numbers have stabilized. They work with libraries to get information they need and give them feedback.
- 46,000 downloads a year. People with membership, not members, very healthy download usage in the course of a year. Some of the articles are driven by marketing efforts.
- Everyone can see abstracts and table of contents. Newest issue is out.
- Sorry to disappointed and we should have done something sooner.
- Perhaps advertise on social media: special issue, new and interesting contest.
- Gerardo: thank you for talking through things. Appreciation for Sarah Cooper phone calls, efforts as they tried to get handle of things. He asked that OUP to go above and beyond the boiler plate to highlight articles. What else can be done to give extra exposure to try to make up for the lack? What can OUP commit to?
- Trish responds: as soon its online it can be read and cited
- Gerardo: advance access for third issue is lagging. There's more you can do and more in the scope of commitment to each other. He wants to see OUP press beyond the regular.

Committee Reports

- Membership: 629 members. 26% is students and low income. 70% are domestic in US, 40% are women compared to ASA is 42%. General trend is declining membership but that's true for everyone. Been discussing the idea of student membership particularly graduate student. What can we do to increase those members? What tends to be useful is professionalization and seminars for graduate students that would attract them to the ASR. WOASR reception (which is Saturday night event) last year was well received about 32-45 women attended. Some people more interested in mentoring than presenting. We could increase non-academics. Melissa asked about if members can pay for their students to sponsor student members. Ryan got requests to add professional development and the program was too full. High percentage of people are members of all three big religion associations.
- Fichter (by Jim C.): The committee made full use of the funding. We should make it clear in the call that people should not aim for more than \$5,000 given the number of applications and the \$12,000 cap.
- McNamara report: 15 submissions, great committee. Agreement on top 3.
- Distinguished Article Award: It is the first year in 3 we did an honorable mention. Had a hard time deciding, which speaks to high quality of papers in the journal. Recommendation: size of the committee. Nicolette and Alex will rotate off. We should provide a public rationale for why the award is limited to people in the sociology of religion. Jim: It highlights the importance of the journal. When limiting we are highlighting our journal and create a motivation to submit articles to our journal. The same article can get picked by numerous associations if we open up to other journals. Council was supportive to limit. On the website we can present a better rationale for why council decided to do that. It was a 2 year period so it's possible for the same article to be nominated twice. We used calendar year, but we do not recommend doing that. Motion to limit the articles to the prior year's volume. Seconded. Most said yes and 1 no. More discussion. Gerardo: want to highlight recent article so the previous year's volume makes sense. Motion to consider articles in previous number volume. Most supported and 2 no's. It passed.
- Lifetime Achievement: They will work on this award next year. Milagros P. is on the committee.

Jim C. announcements:

- If you feel like potential distractions during the conference are worth more than \$1,500, let me know (referring to the construction going on outside of the hotel).
- Tickets and badges downstairs

- Hope you enjoy the conference. We have a great hotel staff.

Michael Emerson publically thanked Jim for his service.

2016 Business Meeting Minutes

Sunday, August 21, 11:40-12:40

Jim Cavendish calls the meeting to order at 11:48 AM.

Jim C. talks about the purpose of the business meeting to report on the first council meeting. He mentions the new officers.

Jim C. reported that we renewed our contracts with OUP and Gerardo Marti as editor. He also reported on the strong financial status of ASR. He reported that all committees had good reports so they are functioning well (except Lifetime Achievement Award, but we will have the first one next year). He explained that the Lifetime Achievement Award committee will get together this fall, draft a call for nominations, and email the distribution. The committee will meet and by the spring and select a nominee who will receive the award at next year's opening reception along with the rest of the awards

Jim C. points out that the newly elected and new appointees of council are mentioned on the inside cover of the ASR program.

Jim C. discusses the current program. We have a fuller program this year compared to previous years. We have 7 sessions per time block compared to 5 in previous years. Ryan and Jason helped recruit author meets critic sessions, so we have more of those sessions than we had in other years. Having author meets critic sessions brings authors to our conference who may not have otherwise attended. Authors tend to like to come to places where we are talking about their books. As long as the hotel can accommodate the additional sessions that is ok. In the past we have accepted abstracts as long as they meet the minimum qualifications. When people are not accepted, their abstracts don't meet our basic qualifications

Jim C. discusses our contract negotiation process with OUP. It was a little more intense with soliciting proposals of multiple publishers. He recognized Melissa Wilde and Trish Thomas for their work. Because the proposal process was competitive, we now have a guaranteed royalty of \$55,000, which is up from \$50,000. We now have \$15,000 instead of \$10,000 for editorial support and \$1,000 instead of \$500 for our Annual Meeting sponsorship.

Gerardo Marti discussed the journal. Our acceptance rate has moved from 8.3 to 11.7%. The quality of the articles being published and their scope has been great. He has increased the international makeup of the editorial board. He welcomes feedback regarding the journal.

Jim C. reports on the membership committee. In general, association memberships are declining. We have relatively stable numbers around 630 members, which fluctuates throughout the year. Most people renew their membership around the meeting because they need to be members to submit an abstract. Andrea Henderson looked at the number of women in our membership. She initiated the Women of ASR events. It. Our membership is around 40% women. However, Jim thinks meeting attendance may have a higher percentage of women. We have 45 different countries represented in our membership, but we don't see that diversity in conference attendees due to travel visas. We value our book series partly because our international scholars value that outlet.

Jim C. reports on the Gallagher recipients. Three scholars received \$1,000 each and six graduate students received \$500 each. We dispense the awards in the form of free hotel nights so the association can help meet its room block at the hotel.

Jim C. reports on the Fichter recipients.

Sabrina Danielsen reports on the McNamara graduate student paper award. We received 15 submissions. The award helps recognize graduate student work. The winner is Landon Schnabel. Dan Olson asked about multi authored papers. Sabrina says all authors have to be graduate students and ASR members. They can't defend before they submit a paper. Jim C. adds that we always invite the winner to present the paper. Sabrina thought about an Honorable Mention but we may consider that in the future.

Jim C. suggests that committees may want to review the criteria of their work and suggest ways to improve it.

Jim reports on the Distinguished Article Award. Last year council voted to limit award to just those articles published in *Sociology of Religion* to highlight the journal. At the first council meeting, we voted to consider articles published in the preceding volume rather than the two previous years.

Jim asked for questions and suggestions for ASR improvement. No response.

Michael Emerson asked about a book award committee. Jim C. says it was discussed and it would be a lot of work. Melissa Wilde says we wanted an award to fill a niche. The Lifetime Achievement isn't offered elsewhere but a book award is. Jim says we could potentially build an author meets critics award around a book award.

Melisa W. asked about giving a name to the different awards. Dan Olson says the ASA Religion section voted down to give a name to the awards.

Gerardo M. supports adding a book award. He says serving on a committee draws people into the association. Jim says we can invite awardees to serve on the committee. Melissa says we should do that. Jim C. states that when future incoming president elects are thinking about appointees for committees, they should consider the recipients of the awards for those committees.

Jim C. suggests new business. We amended the constitution to clarify the appointment process. We made that change to have a steady rotation of committee membership. It may not be as big of an issue with the development committee who need to have a long time knowledge of the financial state of the ASR. We may want to have those people more long term of that committee. Dan Olson asked about potentially having a treasurer who can have a standing long term interest in the financial operations of the association.

Mellissa W. asked about a newsletter editor. Jim C. adds that someone who can and would like to work on the website would be helpful. He also mentioned the addition of a secretary to take minutes.

Jim C. mentions that we might want to review our constitution for any deficiencies, such as no policy for dissolution.

Gerardo M. discussed potentially highlighting an emerging scholar in a plenary type of session. He suggests that members of the editorial board could be on that committee. Melissa would want an application structure rather than a network type of situation for open solicitations. Dan O. asked about a special session with 3-4 emerging scholars with diverse substantive and methodological interests. Perhaps the editorial board could select among articles written by junior scholars who we could invite to the ASR conference. This would also encourage additional participation in the conference. Paula Nesbitt suggested that this could bring a wide diversity of scholars to our conference and could be very interesting.

Jim C. reported that he and Rachel met with David Briggs. We could collaborate more with journalists and media. We discussed whether we would have general public announcements about our conference or just announcements to academics. David had asked us if there was one session we could advertise to the general public we could advertise it. This could be one way for the conference to connect with the local communities.

Melissa W. mentioned our twitter accounts. We mentioned social media, possibly having press releases regarding the content of our meetings and our journal to share information.

Kevin Christiano recognized Jim C. for his years of service as Executive Officer. The membership voted an expression of thanks and gratitude to Jim for all of his work with the association. Thunderous applause.

Meeting closed 12:35 PM

Association of Sociology of Religion, 2nd Council Meeting Minutes
August 22, 2016
7:00-8:15am
Renaissance Seattle Hotel, Seattle, WA

Present: Michael Emerson, Milagros Pena, Lisa D. Pearce, Di Di Rice, Dan Olson, Richard Flory Jeremy Uecker Mary Ellen Konieczny, Rachel Kraus, James Cavendish

The meeting was called to order at 7:08 a.m. by President Michael Emerson who asked everyone to go around and introduce themselves. He welcomed the new members of council.

Discussions of the Annual Meeting 2016

Michael Emerson invited the council to discuss what they thought about how the Annual Meeting went and if there are any things that need to be improved. Dan Olson raised the issue that some of the sessions, especially the sessions on Sunday, were not well attended. But he also recognized the high quality of all sessions. Milagros Peña shared the same concern with Dan Olson. She said that part of the reason why some of the sessions were not well attended was because there were so many sessions in the annual meeting this year. The attendance rate might increase if the number of accepted papers goes down. But, on the other hand, limiting the accepted papers may also decrease the membership of ASR.

Related to the membership of ASR, Rachel Kraus discussed the possibility of raising the membership fee. She repeated Mary Ellen Konieczny's original proposal that council members should vote for the possibility of rising the membership fee for students, for example, from the \$20 (the current rate) to \$25. This decision should be made before Oct.31st 2016. Jeremy Uecker seconded the proposal. Mary Ellen Konieczny added that the development committee should investigate the rationale of rising the membership fees and discuss how long it will take to achieve the one million goal. Again, it is emphasized that this decision about membership fee has to be made before Oct.31st, 2016.

In addition to the concerns about the attendance rate of each session, Mary Ellen Konieczny also said that a major motivation for graduate students to present in ASR was because graduate students want to conduct a power point presentation instead of a roundtable presentation. A power point presentation helps them to receive extensive feedback. In roundtable presentations in the annual meeting of American Sociological Association (ASA), graduate students are only able to receive feedback from a few attendants in the roundtable. Lisa D. Pearce suggested that sessions may be well attended if discussants are added to certain sessions. Jeremy Uecker further said that when graduate students submit their paper next year, they could be offered the option of being willing to present in a session with a discussant. In that case, these graduate students need to submit their complete paper, 15-20 pages in length, approximately one month before the annual meeting. Dan Olson, however, was concerned that the number of submission will be decreased if we require graduate students to submit a complete paper draft in advance. Rachel Kraus further raised the issue that people who are willing to present in these session with discussants may be interested in different topics, which will increase the burden of the program chair to sort these papers into sessions.

Rachel Kraus stated that one possibility is creating more roundtable presentations in ASR to allow graduate students to receive feedbacks on their papers. These papers could be at any stage, and the roundtable setting may provide graduate students with a good space to discuss their paper with more people. Michael Emerson worried that people may perceive not having roundtable presentations as a good thing about ASR. Rachel Kraus agrees with this concern. She said that roundtable presentations may have a certain stigma that may discourage people from submitting their papers to ASR. Mary Ellen Konieczny further stated that roundtable presentations are usually shorter, meaning that it gives the presenter a shorter period of time to present their work. Dan Olson clarifies that a round table presentation only lasts for 50 minutes in the Annual Meeting of the ASA, and there are usually four presenters in a roundtable session. This means that each presenter gets about ten minutes to present their work. Another concern from the council about having round tables in ASR is that one presenter in the roundtable usually receives the most feedback, and the other several other participants may not receive sufficient comments on their papers. The council agrees that there will not be roundtables in the annual meeting ASR next year.

Regarding this year's annual meeting, Mary Ellen Konieczny asked why there was no presidential session this year and whether there will be a presidential session next year. Mary Ellen Konieczny said that presidential sessions may be a place to have discussants. She suggested that we can make a call to encourage people to submit papers for the presidential sessions. Michael Emerson agreed, saying that we can try it the next year.

Mary Ellen Konieczny also suggested having a panel just with graduate students and letting the most motivated graduate students to present their papers. Michael Emerson agreed with the proposal of having a session with papers presented by graduate students, but he was also concerned about the attendance of this potential session, and the themes of these sessions.

Proposals about Panel Discussions in Annual Meeting 2017

Michael Emerson then presented his thoughts on the annual meeting next year.

1. *Having a panel of graduate students.* Mary Ellen Konieczny stated that we can mimic the model of the junior theorists symposium in ASA. She said the key to the success of the junior theory discussions at the ASA is that people who organized this session really care about developing theories. This junior theorists symposium at the ASA also provides graduate students with a space to present their work and receive feedback. In future ASR annual meetings, discussants in the “graduate student session” can be seniors who are able to provide graduate students with comments.
2. *Having a panel of international scholars.* Dan Olson was concerned about people being offended by being sorted into a session only with international scholars. Milagros Peña stated that for this potential session for international scholars, what really matters should not be their affiliation with an institution outside the US, but the subject they are studying. Mary Ellen Konieczny agreed, saying that having a panel with scholars who study religion outside the US may expand our understanding of religion. We can invite scholars from both the US and other countries to bring together their papers and have a theme surrounding these papers. Richard Flory contended that this international session may not be well attended if the attendants are not interested in some part of the world. The council decided that we will not have a panel that is specifically for international students unless some papers from international scholar’s center around a specific theme.
3. *Having a session about religion outside the US.* Richard Flory suggested that we may have a session about the growth of religion in a specific context outside the US. Attendants may be interested in understanding why a certain religious tradition is thriving in a context outside the US. Richard Flory may propose a session on this topic.
4. *Having a session for journalists.* Michael Emerson proposed to have a session for journalists. Richard Flory has some connections with potential journalists to invite to this session. Michael Emerson also suggested to invite David Briggs. The council raises the issue of the expense for their attendance. The council have reached a consensus that, instead of paying for their travel expense, ASR will sell to these journalists about the benefits of attending this session. For instance, journalists may be able to be connected with more people. Michael Emerson will contact with David Briggs regarding this potential session.
5. *Having a session for emerging scholars.* Michael Emerson raised the possibility of having a session for emerging scholars. The editorial board from Sociology of Religion may recommend some emerging scholars who are doing intriguing work. Dan Olson supported this idea. He suggested that we may want to expand our focus from the manuscripts submitted to *Sociology of Religion* (the journal) to a general call for people who are not tenured to submit papers to this session for emerging scholars. Milagros Peña agreed that expanding the focus from Sociology of Religion (the journal) will make this session more inclusive. Mary Ellen Konieczny said that a small committee may need to be formed to select papers for this session. Milagros Peña stated that senior people can hopefully be involved in this small committee, but it should not be just senior people. Michael Emerson decided that we will have a session for emerging scholars in the meeting 2017.

Discussions about Logistic Issues in Annual Meeting 2017

Michael Emerson discussed logistical issues for the annual meeting in 2017 in Montreal, Quebec. Rachel Kraus clarifies that the prices listed in the meeting agenda is in Canadian dollar. The current US equivalent for hotel, for example, is \$189, which is a reasonable price. Next year, the hotel also requires a lower minimum for food and beverage. Dan Olson pointed out that before the annual meeting, we should send people reminders to apply for visas and passports. Milagros Peña also suggested that we should send attendants a reminder about having Canadian dollars in cash to pay airport tax and the transportation from the airport to hotel. US dollars are not received in terms of airport tax. Jim Cavendish talked about the percentage of participants who are staying in the conference hotel. Jim Cavendish said that only 40 percent of the attendants to the annual meeting stayed in the conference hotel, which is really low. The low booking rate for conference hotel raises the issue that these people who stay in the conference hotel bear the cost for this association. And the number of free meeting rooms that we get is dependent on the booking rate for the conference hotel. For example, we get free meeting rooms if we reach the expected booking rate for the conference hotel. Otherwise, we would need to rent conference rooms. Jim Cavendish said that this comparatively low booking rate for a conference hotel is consistent over years. And he understands that some attendants, especially graduate students, have legitimate reasons to find cheaper hotels instead of staying in the conference hotel. Jim Cavendish suggested that, similar to what some other associations are doing, we may have a higher registration fee for people who do not stay in the conference hotel. Jim Cavendish said another possibility is giving a larger amount of travel grants to subsidize graduate students and encourage them to stay in the conference hotel.

Discussions about Annual Meeting 2018

Michael Emerson raised the issue that the annual meeting in 2018 will overlap with the ASA annual meeting, which limits our hotel selection. Rachel Kraus agrees that there are some concerns about having too many overlaps between ASR and the religion session in ASA. And this overlap does limit our hotel options from six to only two.

Rachel Kraus raised the issue of having a secretary to take minutes at the council and business meetings. Council discussed whether the position of secretary would be informal or elected. Dan Olson made a motion that the Executive Officer can appoint someone to take minutes for him/her. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. It was suggested that perhaps a graduate student would be a good person for this role.

Under New Business:

- Perhaps we can form a social media ad hoc committee?
- Financial issues: Rachel Kraus will send around a revised budget when she gets cost estimates from the webmaster regarding a few changes to the website. Also, her course release is \$3,500 and not the \$3,000 that is listed in the initial budget that Jim sent around via email.

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 AM