

**AAR/WR Section Chairs**  
**14 March 2010**  
**Arizona State University, Tempe**

Present: Rebecca Moore, Presiding; Souad Ali, Dyron Daughrity, Natalie Fawcett, Tim Helton, Helen Hwang, Jordan Johnson, Toby Johnson, Susan Maloney, Paula L. McGee, Franz Metcalf, Mutombo Nkulu-Nsengha, Hester Oberman, Norris Palmer, Sophia Pandya, Arisika Razak, Philip Boo Riley, Sarah Robinson, Jennifer, Rycenga, Kristy Slominski, Jason Smick, Jon R. Stone, Jill Snodgrass, Siroj Sorajjakad, Raedorah C. Stewart, Laura Truxler, Dirk von der Horst, Ann Wertman, Roy Whitaker, Annette Williams, Theresa Yugar

1. Agenda setting. Agenda items included Policies, Participation, and Recruitment.
2. Regionally Elected Directors (REDs) Report. Maloney described the role of the AAR national REDs. One issue that has emerged from the experience of the split between AAR and SBL, is the identification of AAR as not a democratic organization. A Task Force was set up to identify how AAR can be re-structured to be more democratic. There currently is a proposal to reduce the size of the national Board (reduce the number of members). Another Task Force was set up to study the regions to see how they are serving AAR membership. This is why it is important to complete the (unscientific) survey available at the meeting. Razak said the survey will provide data to the national office that may increase funding of the regions. Maloney reported that AAR/WR is the only region that has an award for independent scholars, in addition to having student paper awards. She noted that the AAR/WR Board adopted a resolution to ask the national AAR to increase the subvention by \$2500. Williams asked about teleconferencing for board meetings. Maloney said national committees are using webcam for meetings.
3. Policies. There was a general discussion of ways to streamline the paper approval process. Duplication of acceptances continues to be a problem. Some section chairs wanted to see both first and second choice proposals; others wanted just to review first choice proposals. Clarity of discipline was cited as an issue, as was chair workload. Moore proposed that they continue for one more year to receive both first and second choice proposals, setting aside second choice proposals on the assumption that the appropriate section would be reviewing the first choice.
4. Participant Forms. The group agreed that the Call for Papers and the Participant forms need to be clearer to specify the following issues:
  - a) An applicant may submit only a single Participant Form, but may specify first and second choice panels for consideration.
  - b) An applicant must be a member of AAR to submit a proposal. (Membership can be verified by going onto the national AAR website.)

c) An applicant may only present a single time at the AAR/WR region. If by accident a presenter has a proposal accepted by two panels, s/he must notify \*both\* section chairs immediately of this situation so that it can be remedied right away.

5. Section Chairs. The group went through all Section Chair listings. See attached sheet for proposed changes.

Notes taken by Rebecca Moore  
14 March 2010