

**ANHS Executive Council Conference Call Meeting
December 8, 2017**

Meeting began at 11:30am Eastern Time.

Present: Sienna Craig, Steven Folmar, Heather Hindman, Galen Murton, Jessica Vantine Birkenholtz

Notetaker: Anne Naparstek

Heather Hindman (HH) called the meeting to order, beginning the conversation on the formation of the Executive Council.

1. Formation of the Executive Council

HH reported on the status of the call for new members to join the EC, noting that she was aware of six people who had been named as potential EC members: 1) Luke Wagner (grad student), 2) Rupak Shrestha (grad student), 3) Geoff Childs, 4) Ather Zia, 5) Laura Kunreuther (HH – should have said Kathy Rankin), and 6) John Sanderson. Discussion by the group followed on the merits of each candidate. Some concern was expressed on having members on the EC that had not previously been active in ANHS. HH wondered whether anyone should be brought on to the EC now, and SC wondered where the number of members on the EC currently stood. HH reported that the EC currently had 9-10 members and the constitution indicated that 9-13 are needed, so there is room to grow if desired.

SC mentioned further potential candidates that she had thought of: Laura Ahearn, Ariana Maki, Coralynn Davis, Milan Shrestha and Dinesh Paudel. Further discussion ensued about what each candidate would bring to the organization, with all agreeing that the list included excellent candidates.

GM expressed strong support for keeping the position of a graduate student on the EC, which was echoed by JVB and SC. All present agreed that Rupak Shrestha and Geoff Childs would be excellent additions to the EC, bringing experience and dedication to the position. HH proposed to send a vote out to the full EC to add Geoff Childs and Rupak Shrestha to the EC effective immediately. In addition, she proposed contacting the others who had been nominated to see if they would be willing to commit to working on a committee or on overseas relationship building, with the idea that a further 1-2 people could be added to the EC at the October meeting in Madison.

All agreed that this was a good plan.

HH recapped the conversation up to this point for SF, who joined the call after the beginning of the discussion.

2. Budget

HH moved the conversation to the 2018 budget, noting a few highlights: uncertainty surrounding funding from CAORC remains as the US government decides on its budget, no HSC in 2018 will mean no income from that program as in 2017, and the 2018 budget will likely spend some of the rollover from the 2017 budget and overall looks fine. HH indicated that she wanted to send out the budget for approval in early 2018, but first hoped for input as to whether anything should change or if funds should be reallocated to other projects. A brief discussion of the KRC budget being different but nonetheless playing a role in shaping the overall budget ensued. HH reminded the EC of the discussion to expand the Travel Grant funds that occurred at the EC meeting in Boulder. She also mentioned that currently the only difference in the 2017 and 2018 budgets is the subventions on the journal.

The conversation turned back to the KRC issue and the results of the survey that had been sent to the EC. SF expressed that, while he did not agree with the results of the survey, he realized that the majority saw things differently. HH noted that those who did vote saw change as necessary for the continued success of ANHS, including: exploring other overseas options in the region, reducing KRC costs, moving offices, and prioritizing language offerings. SF wondered what the timeline for the changes would be. SC suggested that the changes occur during the first quarter of 2018, which would give a three-month window for transitions, would be fair to current staff, and would give time to consider the logistics involved in moving offices and shifting staff roles. HH and GM both agreed that this timeline sounded reasonable. HH expressed the need for help from the EC in figuring out how to implement the options, noting that opening the conversation with various institutions about the KRC reconfiguring means that the information is public.

Further discussion followed about how staffing will be affected with the reconfiguration/relocation of KRC offices. EC members agreed that current staff should not be excluded from being considered for any new position that might form, but that it was difficult to say what that position would be without knowing where the office might move to and what sort of staff/support might already be in place at the new location. JVB expressed her preference for keeping current staff in a different capacity, if willing, that would allow ANHS to utilize the strengths and experience already gained. SF suggested that there would be two ways to handle redefining the position: 1) current staff would need to apply for any new position or 2) the position could be redefined internally while keeping current staff. SF expressed the need to discuss how to handle this situation among the EC and figure out which option would be best for ANHS. HH reminded everyone of the need to make KRC cost less so as to move funds elsewhere, and that the EC would need to figure out a way to make this happen, perhaps by continuing to employ current staff in a different position that would be funded by members who need services. She offered to send around the 2018 budget with no changes to all in case it was helpful to see how things needed to change. SF indicated that the proposed 2018 budget should accurately reflect as best as possible the changes needed at KRC. GM recalled that, when previously working through possible alternatives to the KRC structure, the budget projection for downsizing services and relocation did not reflect large savings. HH agreed that this was a problem, and that this was one reason why she was requesting permission/help from the EC to

re-open the conversation about restructuring the KRC with other institutions in Kathmandu. She indicated that she would be willing to request budgets from other institutions, and wanted to make sure she had the mandate to do so. SC and GM asserted that the survey results gave HH that mandate, and GM noted that doing so was necessary in order to advance the 2018 budget. HH said she would start the conversations with other institutions.

The discussion continued with EC members expressing the need to be sensitive to current staff and their commitment to ANHS, while also being forthright about the need for change. All agreed that it would be important to be direct with current KRC staff, to be clear about what ANHS can/cannot promise, to note that the restructuring is an institutional mandate to ensure that the needs of all members are being met and is not a personal decision, and to convey that there are not enough resources to keep the status quo while also meeting the mandate. HH offered to create a letter to send through the EC for comment before sending to KRC staff. SC suggested that the letter come from the KRC sub-committee, to help indicate that the decisions are the result of a collective process and not just from one person. GM agreed with this idea and offered to start drafting a letter with the KRC sub-committee and pass it through the EC for comment. JVB suggested that HH still gather info from discussions with other institutions at the same time as the conversation with KRC staff is occurring. HH asked the EC which institutions would be beneficial to look into and was given the suggestions of the Social Science Baha, the South Asia Institute of Heidelberg, and Martin Chautari. SC asked about the Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies (CNAS) at Tribhuvan University. HH mentioned that she had looked into this possibility but that she was not sure whether it would work. She indicated that she would be happy if another EC member wanted to explore this option further but that her plate was full with the three other options. After further conversation, it was decided to explore the first three suggestions for now and to work to develop a relationship regarding collaboration on visas and lectures with CNAS in the future.

HH reiterated the action items from the conversation to ensure that all agreed:

- 1) Move forward with two new additional members to the EC now
- 2) Draw in the others mentioned as potential EC members to work on committees and re-open the discussion in anticipation of the October EC meeting in Madison
- 3) Explore new locations for the KRC
- 4) KRC sub-committee draft a letter for current KRC staff concerning the restructuring

HH wondered if anyone had other questions or concerns. GM noted that he would be in Kathmandu in late December and volunteered his services in meeting with people to see what options might be available for KRC.

HH offered a few final reminders, of meeting in January to review the 2017 budget; of keeping in mind ideas for conference locations, including UVA; and of the EC meeting for sure happening at the Madison conference in October, not on Sunday. SF suggested that a Friday meeting would be more preferable, as traveling to get to Madison on Thursday would increase his burden and the number of classes he would have to miss teaching. He also mentioned that the

October meeting likely would be his last as his term was expiring. HH noted that the conference coordinators were still deciding, and that a Friday or Saturday meeting would conflict with another conference event, but that they would try to accommodate as many preferences as possible. SC wondered whether she was expected to be at the meeting and HH indicated that the new editors would be in place by January 1, 2018, and SC did not have to attend.

With no further discussion, HH thanked all for their time and input and adjourned the meeting.