

**Annual ANHS Executive Council Meeting 2016**  
**October 21, 2016. 7pm-12am, Madison Concourse Hotel, Madison, WI**

Called to order at 7:15pm

**Present:** Teri Allendorf, Mary Cameron, Steven Folmar, Jana Fortier, Heather Hindman, Sya Kedzior, Galen Murton, Debarati Sen, Pasang Sherpa, Mark Turin, Jessica Vantine Birkenholtz, Heidi Wiederkehr

**Absent:** Keshav Bhattarai, Sienna Craig, Bill Fisher, Paul Karan

**Notetaker:** Anne Naparstek

Heather Hindman (HH) called the meeting to order. She presented a plaque that was created to express thanks to P. Karan for his years of service to the ANHS EC. HH also presented a gift to Mary Cameron (MC) and thanked her for her work as president of ANHS. All present thanked Mary.

Introductions were made, with HH diverting from the agenda in order to introduce the Council of American Overseas Research Centers (CAORC) and its representative, Heidi Wiederkehr (HW). HW provided the EC with an overview of CAORC's operations and services, including its most recent funding to ANHS for 2016 and 2017. HW discussed the need for a centralized office for ANHS, citing the ability to save money and share services. She outlined what services CAORC could provide to ANHS, including legal counsel, a development specialist to help with grant writing, and social media training. Mark Turin (MT) raised the question of ANHS being a regional center and wondered whether ANHS could connect with other regional centers to share experiences and best practices. HW agreed that this would be a good opportunity, with regional ORCs in North Africa, West Africa, and the South Caucasus. HW also explained the difference between CAORC funding and Department of Education Title VI funding. HH noted that ANHS applied for Title VI funding in the summer of 2016, but was unsuccessful in getting the grant, though submitted a very competitive application. Further discussion of CAORC funding, State Department funding ensued, with HW indicating that CAORC will try to get funding for ANHS starting in October 2017, noting that the State Department funds based on its own priorities. More discussion of various ORCs, CAORC, and their histories followed, with HW suggesting that EC members visit the CAORC homepage to get a better sense of the different types of ORCs. HH reiterated that CAORC facilitates links between like organizations, enabling the sharing of best practices and the exchange of ideas. Teri Allendorf (TA) brought up the Mongolia Center as a good model of ideas to look at, and wondered whether the American Institute of Indian Studies (AIIS) would be another place to look into. HH noted that AIIS may support ANHS' Title VI application because AIIS does not support languages of North India. HW also noted the Iraq and Amman centers, which do not have brick and mortar centers. Other services that CAORC provides include a discounted rate or JSTOR at the ORC, an online system for fellowship applications, meetings with other Centers, working with CAORC staff on funding applications, etc. Discussion continued, with how to apply this to ANHS and KRC, including the ideas of: collaboration between a US Director and KRC Director, looking into other grants to write with CAORC help, trying to get ANHS into the State Department grant, reading other ORC by-laws and policies, re-invigorating the ad hoc communications and grants committee, trying to get more members involved and using KRC resources, using administrative help to both gather text for grant proposals from member exports and then make the text proposal-ready,

asking members to write ANHS/KRC into their own grant proposals for services. Sya Kedzior (SK) noted that, with four more years before the next Title VI grant competition, it may help to have EC members review the feedback from the most recent grant proposal, and may be cause for re-organizing the committee. MC recommended having roles be more defined so that everyone would know the expectations. HH reminded all of the limitations of the Constitution in adding new committees, but proposed that sub-committees could be made, with the Chair of a sub-committee needing to be from the EC, while utilizing non-EC members to fill out the sub-committee. HH noted the benefit of training non-EC members in this way so that they can be more involved and possibly become future EC members. Further discussion followed of other models of organizations, where institutional members are represented on a Board of Trustees that meets separately from a smaller Executive Committee, and the need to investigate how to bring more institutional members into ANHS workings, with HH noting that ANHS is unique among ORCs in being driven by individual members rather than institutional members. Galen Murton (GM) suggested that ANHS implement the requirement for the host of an ANHS conference (e.g. HSC) be an institutional member for a period of years, providing both institutional memory of the conferences and building and institutional membership legacy. MC suggested reaching out to programs on South Asia and connecting with those students and faculty to build relationships. Other discussion on this topic included: MU assisting with visas, which SK noted as a huge boon to institutional members in-country, and all agreed ANHS should be charging for; MU assisting with IRB approvals, which should also have a price associated with it; reminding members to put ANHS services into their grant proposals; reviewing, clarifying, and updating the statement of current benefits for members. HH indicated that this step would be a major project to generate a price list for KRC services, for both members and non-members, and wondered if anyone would be willing to take it on. SK cautioned that the price list be very carefully worded.

HH thanked HW for attending the meeting and answering questions about CAORC. All thanked HW for her assistance.

At 8:05, the EC took a short break and HW left the meeting.

At 8:15, the meeting was reconvened.

1. Approval of minutes from February 2016

HH returned to the agenda and called for a vote to approve the meeting minutes from the EC meeting held at the HSC conference in Austin. Jessica Vantine Birkenholtz (JVB) noted that her name was misspelled.

*HH called for a motion to approve the minutes with the change to JVB's name. MT seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.*

2. Discussion of EC Status

HH raised the issue of attendance at the EC meetings, noting a list of which EC members have missed meetings, whose terms are expiring, etc. HH suggested that, with one EC member cycling off the committee after this meeting, no replacement be made since the EC is currently at its

maximum capacity. Some suggestions regarding the benefits of a smaller EC included having only those members who are fully invested be on the EC and a greater ability to meet outside of the annual meeting, by telephone or other method. MT wondered whether the *ex officio* journal editors are included in the EC numbers with the same expectations as active members of the EC. HH indicated that the Constitution left this issue open to interpretation and opened the question to the entire EC. The consensus from the discussion was that editors should be considered special board members, encouraged to attend the EC meetings, but not disciplined if unable to attend. Further discussion of the term *ex officio* continued with respect to voting. HH proposed that the editor office be represented at the meeting and that the office may have one vote regardless of how many editors are present. SK noted that *ex officio* members should not be counted in terms of reaching quorum. MT was asked for input on whether editors should be at the meetings. He responded that it is important for the office to be represented for reporting and to discuss any matters pertaining to the journal, but that it can be difficult to attend due to not having resources to support travel. The EC decided to discuss the role of the editors with the new editors before finalizing these expectations.

MC returned to the question of whether to replace the member currently cycling off or to keep the EC at a smaller number. Discussion on this topic included the difficulty of accomplishing tasks between meetings because of the large size, the idea of expanding participation in ANHS but not adding numbers to the EC, having monthly meetings by conference call, committing to having a Skype (or other type) call in December or January of years when needed, and the difficulty in having actual discussions on large conference calls. HH and JVB suggested having the committees meet virtually more often and then report on their meetings back to the EC. The conclusion of the discussion was that the entire EC should have 1-2 telephone or online meetings as needed and that committees should be encouraged to meet virtually as needed and report back to the EC.

HH turned the conversation to the problem of member absences. The rule from the Constitution is that anyone missing more than one meeting during a four-year term should consider leaving the EC. Looking at EC history, this rule has not been enforced. Discussion of member absences at the past few meetings ensued, with HH putting the question to the EC of whether they should act on this with two current members who have missed more than one meeting, noting that the Constitution actually puts the onus on the member to resign. Further discussion of the issues with quorum, with the rule allowing one missed meeting, and how to approach these two members continued. HH clarified that EC members may serve for one four-year term, which can be renewed for a second four years, noting that the onus of renewal is unclear. MC recalled that the practice has been that members have been notified of their term expiring and asked if they wanted to continue on the EC. Because HH had spoken with one of the members in question about the issue, there was some discussion of whether this person could then be asked to resign. It was agreed on to be sure to be clear about expectations for future EC members when they are brought on. For both members in question, it was decided that HH as president should have a conversation with each of them, laying out the language in the Constitution, noting what meetings were missed, and asking or suggesting that they resign if they are not fully committed to the EC. SK noted that with two people leaving, plus one member's tenure ending, the EC size

is shrinking dramatically. Jana Fortier (JF) reminded the EC of the opportunity for diversity on the Board with these openings. HH left the ultimate decision on replacing the EC members to the next meeting, noting that other interested parties have approached her about serving on the EC.

### 3. Discuss Proposals

#### A. KRC ad hoc committee

HH proposed the creation of an ad hoc committee on the KRC, noting that it informally already exists comprised of people who visit the KRC regularly and help guide its operations and direction. The ad hoc committee would act as an advisory or liaison committee between the EC and MU, and would be used as a way to centralize communications with KRC and who is working with MU. Discussion of how this committee would work followed, including some of the issues that need to be addressed, including giving MU a sense of whom he can talk to and what is then reported back to the EC. Since MU does not know all of the EC members or what their roles are, he doesn't know who to speak with about issues. MC noted that someone should notify MU when someone is visiting KRC in an official capacity, but that the oversight of the KRC is the responsibility of the whole Board, with the president working closely with MU to know what the issues are. The EC discussed the feasibility of monthly Skype meetings with MU, noting that this was a reasonable request. JF indicated that she would be willing to help MU navigate Skype if necessary. SK offered amendments to the proposal, that the ad hoc committee has the first responsibility to 1) assess the issues with the KRC, 2) establish a time frame for communication, 3) set up goals for the coming year, with MU report to the committee and the committee to report to the EC, and 4) assess the long-term need for the committee next year at the official EC meeting. HH accepted the amendment to the proposal of the creation of a KRC ad hoc committee. After further discussion, a fifth amendment was added, 5) to notify MU as soon as possible of the formation and purpose of the committee. More discussion continued as to how to involve MU, make sure that his interests are represented, that he feels a part of the organization, and remains part of the communications about the KRC. Amendment five was then changed to 5) MU invited to be a member of the ad hoc committee. JVB encouraged all to view this committee in a positive light, how to help communication on both sides, to streamline processes, support MU's work, support the president, and have overall positive benefits for all. JF proposed to change the name of the ad hoc committee to the "ad hoc committee on KRC development". This change was agreed upon as amendment 6.

*HH called for a vote to approve the formation of an ad hoc committee on KRC with the amendments that the ad hoc committee has the first responsibility to 1) assess the issues with the KRC, 2) establish a time frame for communication, 3) set up goals for the coming year, with MU report to the committee and the committee to report to the EC, 4) assess the long-term need for the committee next year at the official EC meeting, 5) invited MU to be a member of the committee, and 6) change the name to be the ad hoc*

*committee on KRC development. TA seconded the motion. The motion passed with 10 yes votes and one abstention.*

B. Jim Fisher Prize

HH proposed the creation of a book prize in the name of Jim Fisher, who recently had become a lifetime member of ANHS. She indicated that this discussion had occurred in the past and that now would be a good time to implement the prize. Discussion of the proposal ensued, including the following clarifications to be added to the prize guidelines: 1) books must be published in the past two years, 2) applicants can re-apply if not selected and still within the time guidelines, 3) the committee does not have to select a winner if no submissions meet the prize standards, 4) the book must be printed in English, 5) the prize should start at \$250 with the hope of increasing down the road, 6) co-authored books are allowable, but edited editions are not, 7) reviewers should submit their reviews for publication in *HIMALAYA*, 8) add language that indicates that the review committee would consist of one EC members plus “two or more selected non-EC members and/or other external reviewers, 9) all submissions will have one copy deposited into the KRC library, 10) language should be added to reinforce that the award is for first books only.

*HH called for a vote to support the creation of a Jim Fisher Prize for first books. SK seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.*

C. Elimination of the Senior Prize Fee

HH proposed eliminating the fee to apply for the Senior Prize, noting that the fee discourages members from the Himalayan region from participating. HH also proposed eliminating the tiered aspect of the prize. JF noted that ANHS would likely receive more applications if the fee were eliminated. HH noted that the amount of funds that the fee generates annually is very small. All present agreed that the prize would only be open to members and that EC members could not apply.

*HH moved to eliminate the application fee and tiered structure for the Senior Prize. SK seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.*

D. Creation of a Journal Sustainability Fund

HH raised the question of a journal sustainability fund, noting that it had been created but not yet acted upon. HH provided two reasons for the necessity of the fund: 1) the journal does well for ANHS financially and 2) with new editors, the current subvention, which will expire soon, will not be guaranteed and should not be required when determining the next editorship. MC noted that this fund was already voted on but never implemented. Past meeting minutes were consulted, and it was noted that, in 2014, the creation of the journal sustainability fund was unanimously approved, with an initial investment of \$2,000 plus \$100 per month moving forward. The EC discussed how to now act upon this, noting that the journal is essential to ANHS and should be treated as such. HH

proposed creating a sub-account to the ANHS bank account that would be for this fund only. MT made a case for the necessity of this fund, and the importance of ANHS showing its long-term commitment to the journal. The EC decided to commit \$4,400 to the journal sustainability fund, with \$2,200 being committed right away and another \$2,200 committed on January 2, 2017. The EC also planned to honor the \$100 per month commitment moving forward, indicating that this amount and plan would need to be revisited annually at the official EC meeting. Since this motion had already been voted upon in 2014, a further vote was not held.

4. Membership Discussion

Steve Folmar (SF) presented the membership report, giving thanks to Galen Murton (GM) for all of his assistance. SF noted that ANHS would be well served to gain more institutional members and bring more individual members back into the organization, but that overall the numbers are fairly consistent. He indicated the need to streamline the vast amount of membership categories and to rewrite the currently sterile membership notices and reminders that are automatically sent from Wild Apricot (WA). HH also noted that it should be double checked whether WA sends notices when members select the auto-renew membership option, indicating that WA should not do so. HH praised the efforts of SF and GM throughout the year, and thanked them for their commitment.

5. Prize Discussion

HH noted that the Dor Bahadur Bista Prize was the same as in previous years, the EC had already voted on changes to the Senior Prize, and the EC voted to create the new Jim Fisher book prize.

6. Conference Discussion

TA reported that many similar issues come up in terms of the Conference committee, including the discussion of whether to continue to have the required EC meeting at Madison or at the HSC conference. TA noted that, since the HSC conference in 2017 would be in the fall and many planned on attending, the EC could vote to change the next EC meeting to be held at HSC instead of at Madison. Discussion of the benefits of having the required EC meeting be at Madison versus at HSC each year and that EC members could use travel grants to help defray the costs of attending the meeting followed.

HH gave a report on HSC IV, which was held in Austin, noting that it was very successful and provided some income to ANHS.

GM reported on the upcoming HSC V at Boulder, noting that preparations are moving along very well. He mentioned that he had received feedback that the deadline for the call for papers was approaching to quickly and that it likely would be pushed back in order to allow for more submissions. TA requested that ANHS send out more reminders about the conference to draw more people.

*HH moved to officially change the next required EC meeting in 2017 to be held at the HSC V conference in Boulder. GM seconded the motion. The EC voted in favor of the motion 10-1.*

7. CAORC Report and Review

HH noted that the CAORC Report already occurred at the start of the meeting when HW was present.

8. AORC Grant Report and Review

HH reported on the Title VI grant application process and outcome, indicating that she would send the feedback from the Department of Education review to the EC.

9. HIMALAYA report

MT reported on the search for new journal editors, noting the difficulty in finding one or more people willing to serve who also have institutions which are willing to contribute by offering a subvention, course release, etc. He indicated that, ideally, a new editor would start on January 1, 2018, but would have a long overlap with the current editors throughout 2017. HH noted that the job description is currently posted on the website and circulating by email. Further discussion of how the editors would be selected and whether the EC would ultimately vote on the selection followed.

10. Administrative Review

EC discussed the proposal to fund a 1/6-full time administrative position. Discussion focused on clarifying that funding for this position would not come out of the ANHS budget, but rather would be provided by CAORC directly to the Madison-based offices.

*TA motioned to approve the funding of a 1/6-full time administrative position. SK seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.*

EC discussed enacting a shift in accounting services. HH read the proposal, emphasizing that the shift would be revenue neutral, but potentially involve a learning curve for new staff. MT asked for clarification on which accounting software is used. HH clarified that it is QuickBooks. General discussion ensued on the impact of proposed staffing changes and the ethical and professional considerations of such a shift.

*HH motioned to appoint John Burmaster as ANHS accountant. SK seconded the motion and it passed with 6-3-2 vote (yes-no-abstain).*

11. 2016 YTD Budget

HH explained the budget layout to the EC while EC members reviewed the information presented. JF asked HH to present on any areas of concern. HH noted that the KRC budget was the largest area of concern, with not enough money being spent in order to produce the programs and outcomes that ANHS would like to have from the KRC. HH also noted that membership was down a bit, but not alarmingly, and operating expenses were a bit high. MC

asked what the funds from CAORC for 2016 were being used for. HH indicated that the funds were designated to support administration, both at KRC and Wisconsin, but that the 2017 funds would be less and only for administration at Wisconsin. Further discussion of the budget ensued. MT raised the issue of funds that should be dedicated to the journal publications staying in the membership category because of the payment setup. This note highlighted some of the issues with Wild Apricot and the current accounting system. HH pointed out that the budget included hard numbers for  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the year, but that the remainder of the year was projected. She indicated that the budget was basically on track for 2016 assuming events in the following three months happen as planned.

*HH motioned to approve the  $\frac{3}{4}$  year 2016 budget. SK seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.*

## 12. 2017 Proposed Budget

HH noted some changes to the 2017 proposed budget due to votes taken at the current meeting, namely the fellowship processing fees would be \$0, there would be an added \$250 book prize, and that the travel grant budget, currently set at \$2500, may need to be adjusted to accommodate EC travel to HSC. Discussion of the proposed budget ensued, including the possibility of changing the Constitution so as to amend the dates of the fiscal year. The discussion of the revision of the fiscal year was ultimately put off until the EC telephone meeting in January. HH pointed out that the journal sustainability fund would also be different, per the conversation at the current meeting, and would need to be raised to \$3,400. Discussion of the KRC budget followed, with HH noting that she had not yet received much clarification on budget items from MU. JF asked HH and Debarati Sen (DS) if there were areas of concern that the EC ought to discuss. DS indicated that clarification on the KRC budget should help reduce the expenses shown in that portion of the budget. HH mentioned the request from MU for a raise for his position. The EC discussed the merits of this request, noting that the same request had been put forth last year but was not approved. A comparison of the KRC director salary versus other similar jobs in Kathmandu was presented, with various EC members providing input. TA noted that perhaps this issue could be addressed by the newly created Ad Hoc Committee on KRC Development. MC raised the issue of the journal subvention, with MT noting that the journal subvention fiscal year runs differently than the ANHS fiscal year, and that the amount would have to be reduced to reflect the subvention running out in June of 2017. HH noted two corrections to the budget: 1) the journal subvention should be \$3000 and 2) the journal sustainability fee should be \$3,400. Without having the KRC numbers, TA propose holding off on voting on the 2017 budget until the EC could be surer of the actual proposed numbers. The rest of the EC agreed to wait to vote on the 2017 proposed budget until receiving a KRC version, noting that this should come prior to the EC telephone meeting in January.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55pm.