SSILA 2018 Executive Committee Minutes
Salt Lake City, Embassy Room
January 5, 2018, 7:30-9 AM
Carolyn J. MacKay, Executive Secretary

Present: Keren Rice, Tania Granadillo, Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, Wesley Leonard, Danny Hieber, Martin Kohlberger. On Skype -- B'alam Mateo and Alice Taff.

1. 2017 minutes were approved.

2. Report on travel awards (Czaykowska-Higgins);

SSILA 2018 Student Travel Awards • Report
prepared by Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, 27 December 2017
Selection Committee: Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, Chair; B'alam Mateo; Wesley Leonard

Application process
Application instructions are drafted by Committee Chair and posted on the SSILA website at the same time as the Call for Abstracts for the Annual Meeting is issued. The 2018 announcement was also sent out by email to the SSILA mailing list.
The announcement for the 2018 Travel Awards was basically the same as that for the 2017 Awards:

Travel Assistance Awards
SSILA travel awards are intended to increase participation in SSILA sessions by students and scholars from historically under-represented populations of the Americas.

To apply for a SSILA travel award, email the information requested on the Travel Award Application to the Executive Secretary by August 1. (You can download a copy of these instructions here.)
Awards will be made on the basis of financial need, which should be explained in a succinct paragraph.
In addition, priority will be given to those who:
> • do not have a university or other institutional affiliation
> • are native speakers of indigenous languages
> • are the sole author of a paper or poster, or the joint author of a paper or poster whose coauthor(s) will not be in attendance
> • have not received this assistance previously from SSILA

Applications must be submitted at the time abstracts are due: awards will be made only to applicants whose abstracts are accepted.

Applications will be reviewed by the Travel Assistance Committee in late August and awardees notified at the same time as the acceptance of their papers. Awards will be in the form of a check that will be given to the recipients at the meeting.

Applicants requiring travel visas are urged to apply for them in a timely manner.
As a courtesy to all involved, in the event that an awardee is unable to attend the meetings, early notification should be given so that the award may be passed to someone else.

Review process
The Travel Awards committee used an excel spreadsheet to score the applications. The matrix used for the 2018 Travel Awards was basically the same as that used for SSILA 2017, and is provided along with this document (see SSILA 2018 Travel Awards Scoring Sheet).

Applications for SSILA 2018
  • 8 people applied for travel awards for SSILA 2018; 7 had abstracts accepted. The committee only ranked applications from people whose abstracts were accepted. (See note below under recommendations).
  • The total request for funding was just under $6000.
  • The total amount of funds available to be awarded in 2018 was $2500.
  • One application fit all the criteria (the applicant is from an underrepresented population, without a university affiliation, is a native speaker of an indigenous language, the sole author of a paper, and has not received assistance previously from SSILA) and involved travel from Ecuador.
  • The other applications were all from students (5 from US-based students and 1 from a Canada-based student), none of whom were from underrepresented groups, or native speakers of an indigenous language. One of these applicants had received a Travel award in 2017 and was therefore excluded from consideration for SSILA 2018. One applicant was asking for support for travel from outside the US mainland.
  • On the basis of the rankings of each application, the criteria, the distances that each applicant had to travel, and the amounts that each requested, the committee agreed to award the largest amount to the Ecuadorean applicant (basically the award covers his estimated travel costs), to award the second highest amount to the student travelling from Hawaii, and to split the remaining funds three ways (the Canadian applicant withdrew).

Awardees
We thus agreed to distribute the travel awards as follows:

$1400 Uboye Gaba (was unable to attend)
$500 Ryan Henke
$200 Morgan Sleeper
$200 Alexia Fawcett
$200 Jens van Gysel

Notification to applicants and disbursement of awards
This year the applicants were notified of the Committee's decisions (award and amount) by the Chair of the Travel Awards committee, and were provided with instructions as to how the awards will be disbursed. The Chair also notified the applicants who did not receive Travel Awards. Finally, the Chair provided the Executive Secretary and the President with the list of awardees.

The awardees may receive a check, or if more convenient for them, cash, from the Executive Secretary at the Annual Meeting, once they have presented their papers. Awardees do not need to provide travel related receipts. If given a check, the check should suffice as a bookkeeping record. If the award is made in cash, the awardee may need to sign a receipt.

Discussion/Recommendations (based on committee discussion and comments)

1. The SSILA 2018 Travel Awards committee only ranked applications from people whose abstracts were accepted. This had advantages and disadvantages:

      Advantages: fewer applications needed to be reviewed and ranked AND rankings did not need to be considered more than once (in 2017 the first ranking proposed needed to be altered after it transpired that one or more of the Travel Award applicants had not had their abstracts accepted).

      Disadvantage: the applications were not reviewed until after abstract acceptance/rejection notifications had been sent out. This made it harder for the program committee to complete the organization of the program in a timely fashion.

      Recommendation: rank the applications in late August so that applicants are indeed notified of receipt of award at approximately the same time as they are notified of abstract acceptance.

2. The travel award is strongly focused on enabling attendance of scholars from underrepresented populations and especially speakers of understudied languages. However, as the 2017 Travel Awards committee pointed out, the applicant pool is largely not from either of these groups. Like last year, there was only one applicant this year from an underrepresented population/speaker of an indigenous language. In fact, there's a structural challenge in that the very nature of how one becomes a presenter at SSILA presents an obstacle to the participation of the people intended to receive this award.
Recommendation: Therefore, the committee strongly encourages SSILA **to engage in a greater outreach effort to reach the desired population** next year to encourage applications that would allow SSILA to fulfill the mission of the travel award. We have two suggestions that might help in this regard:

      (1) Start the outreach when the call for papers is sent out. **Make sure that the call for papers includes a very prominent note** on "support for scholars from underrepresented populations".

      (2) SSILA could more actively encourage academic SSILA members to bring more collaborators from language communities into presentations; this might be enough to ensure that somebody will benefit from the award. To do this, it **might be worth deleting the third criterion for the Travel Award** (namely, "are the sole author of a paper or poster, or the joint author of a paper whose co-author(s) will not be in attendance").

      Although this criterion is meant to ensure that the paper is delivered, if the goal is to facilitate the participation of underrepresented groups, the focus needs to be on the people, not on ensuring the presentation itself is given. So, we should think about sending a message that in the case of co-authored presentations, the active presence of non-university-affiliated presenters is highly valued, and that the fact that the university-affiliated co-author will also be attending shouldn't work against the non-university affiliated presenters.

3. The travel assistance, as described, doesn't reference the relative quality of the SSILA abstracts; rather, it suggests a binary category (i.e, the paper is accepted or not). Perhaps it would be appropriate **for abstract quality to factor in as a criterion** (though with less importance than the rest -- maybe only if two applications were truly tied based on other factors).

4. The 2017 and 2018 committee did not have a **Travel Awards application form**. However, this might be useful in the future when participation from under-represented groups is more actively solicited, since it would be available for someone even if they were not actively part of the SSILA membership community.

Suggestions*: Develop better outreach to get more under-represented populations to apply. Develop a policy for following up with the travel arrangements for under-represented populations. We need to work on the wording of such a policy. Award the checks for the Travel Awards during the Business meeting and make it ceremonial.*

3. **Report on Haas award** (Taff);

The Haas committee received and reviewed dissertations submitted by the due date. After careful consideration, the committee decided unanimously not to grant a Haas award for 2017.
Respectfully submitted,
Alice Taff, Gabriela Perez Baez, Jack Martin

Suggestions*: **What can we do to increase the number of submissions for Hale, Golla and Haas.**

4. **Report on Program Committee** (Kohlberger, Bischoff, Rice; draft report attached);

SSILA Program Committee Report 2017 --Prepared by Martin Kohlberger and Keren Rice

This report comes in a few parts. First is an email that was sent to members of the EC about changes made for this year. Second is information about number of submissions, acceptances, and withdrawals (as of December 28). Third is a rough timeline of activities for the Program Committee.

1. Email to Executive Committee
Martin Kohlberger volunteered to take on the newly created position of administrator for the Program Committee. He is just getting started in the job now. I am including him on this email, and want to say thank you to him.

email
We had decided that we would set up a small Program Committee who would augment the Executive Committee in the work involved in choosing reviewers for particular abstracts, reading abstracts, and putting the program together. We have had two volunteers for this, Shannon Bischoff and Analia Gutierrez. I will chair the Program Committee again this year, and I will be in touch with them about one doing it next year and another the following year. The Executive Committee as a whole will still be involved in reading abstracts, but will not have most of the other responsibilities that they have had (for most people, the same responsibilities will continue - reading abstracts - but the officers have been involved in structuring the program as well, and the chair of the committee has assigned readers to abstracts and done a lot of communicating with the Executive Secretary).

We had agreed that the call for organized sessions would go out earlier this year. You should have received a copy of it earlier today. Given the timing, we decided to have two different dates, one for proposals that submitters would like to have considered as jointly sponsored by the LSA and one for proposals for SSILA only. The proposals for jointly sponsored organized sessions are due very soon - May 1. If we receive any, we will get them to you right away, and ask that you read them in a very short time period. The proposals for LSA organized sessions are due on May 15, so (if we have proposals) we will need to decide if they should be sent to the LSA with our support.

Continuing on organized sessions, the due date for other organized session proposals is June 1. We will want to get back to people about these by the beginning of July. If there are proposals that we do not think will work well as an organized session, individuals might choose to submit their abstracts to the meeting separately. The due date for those abstracts will be August 1.

2. Submissions/acceptances/withdrawals

submitted	2018	2017
Organized session:	3 (one also submitted through the LSA)	1

acceptances/withdrawals

Organized sessions:	3	1
Papers: Submitted	76	99
Accepted:	64	88
Rejected	12	11
Withdrawn:	6 (as of December 31, 2017)	

Thank you to reviewers: 34 volunteers, 33 submitted reviews, plus members of the Program Committee.

cf. 2017. 33 volunteers plus members of the Program Committee

3. Timetable

Organized sessions

These calls were sent out together; after May 1, a reminder was sent out about the June 1 deadline for SSILA special sessions.

May 1. Proposals for organized sessions that are looking to be co-sponsored by the LSA due.

May 15. Proposals for organized sessions due, with responses to the proposers by early July. Keren sent the proposals to the Program Committee on June 6, asking for feedback by June 23. Once feedback was received, Keren summarized it and ran it by the Program Committee members before sending it to the submitters.

July 1. Submitters of proposals for organized sessions notified, with summary feedback and request for session overview and short abstracts by September 1.

Regular session

June. Set up EasyChair for submissions. Work on call for papers. Send out call for papers by mid June. Send out call for volunteer reviewers by mid June.

July. Send reminders of abstract deadline.

August 1. Abstracts due.

August.

First few days of August. Assign abstracts to reviewers. In 2017, PC members were assigned 9 or 10 abstracts each, and other reviewers 4 or 5. Each abstract was assigned 3 reviewers. Keren did initial assignments; Martin checked for conflicts of interest. Abstracts should be made available to reviewers as soon as possible since they read and scored by the end of August. In 2016, EasyChair was opened to reviewers on August 7; in 2017 Keren sent a first list of assignments to Shannon and Martin on August 3 and it looks like the website was opened to reviewers on August 7. We asked reviewers to read by August 29, in hope that all would read by September 1. Work with Carolyn on the number of rooms that we can afford (recent years: 2 on Thursday, 3 on Friday, 3 on Saturday, 2 on Sunday).

September. Determine what goes on the program. This is done by the PC chair together with the incoming PC chair and the current president, vice president, and past president of SSILA. This should be done expeditiously so that the date that people are notified coincides with the date that the LSA sends out notifications. This year authors were notified on September 12.

Put the draft program together. This cannot happen until the LSA program is available – usually by mid September. I sent the first draft to members of the PC on September 15.

<u>Email regarding deadlines</u>

Hi Martin and Shannon

We're getting very close to August 1, when SSILA abstracts are due, and I'm just checking in to make sure all is in order.

Martin, I'm sure you know all this, but I am going through it partly for my sake to be sure that things are ready when things get busy next week.

Do you have a list of people who have agreed to read abstracts, together with their areas? If so, it would be helpful if Shannon and I could get that.

All readers (Program Committee, volunteers) need to be added to EasyChair. Shannon and I should be able to view all submitted abstracts but not the authors.

I am going through emails from last year around this time.

I see that Carolyn offered us the opportunity for bidding, but we decided not to do that. I suggest that we not discuss the possibility of bidding this year.

Last year it looks like Carolyn let the Program Committee know how many abstracts there were just after the abstract submission closed. It looks like submissions, while officially due August 1, were actually accepted until mid day on August 2, when the submission page was closed.

It looks like last year all readers, including the PC members, could see only their own reviews until all reviews were in.

I did all reviewer assignment last year. Carolyn then checked to make sure that I had not assigned anyone as the reviewer of their own paper.

I went through the list of people who volunteered to review to make sure that they all had a PhD. It looks like I also checked to make sure that everyone who was on the list to review was also on EasyChair.

It looks like I had done tentative assignments last year by August 4. I prepared two views of the assignments, one organized by abstract number and one organized by reviewer. Carolyn checked it over and we did some fiddling with it, correcting my typos, and so on. Carolyn notified people about what they would review on August 8.

Carolyn handled questions from reviewers, contacting me about them if there were any questions. There was one person who had agreed to read and had to then withdraw, and some conflicts that we had not been able to see, and I reassigned those. It looks like this took a few days to sort out.

A reminder went to reviewers about ten days before the reviews were due.

As people discovered late that they had a conflict, it looks like I read those abstracts if I wasn't assigned them already rather than trying to find a new reviewer. Carolyn assigned them to me on EasyChair.

We asked reviewers to complete their reviews by August 29. It looks like all reviews were in by September 6; all but one were in by September 2.

At that point it looks like past president, president, and president elect made the decision about cut-off. One thing we will need to consider is that we have accepted two organized sessions. And we will need to get advice from Carolyn about how many rooms we can afford to have to know how many papers we can accept. We aimed to notify submitters at the same time the LSA notifies submitters. The LSA will be around September 15. Once we get the decisions made about acceptances, we need to put together the timetable. I did the first draft of that last year, and got lots of feedback. And of course things changed.

I see that I wrote to Carolyn on September 12 saying that I had entered all acceptances/rejections into EasyChair. We had a draft of time slots by then (but people weren't yet assigned to those slots.)

Submitters received comments, and our decision. It looks like there were a few questions about whether an abstract was accepted as a talk or as a poster. We had not accepted anything as posters (outside of organized sessions). Perhaps talk/poster should be specified in the acceptance letter. I think Carolyn had lots of emails that I did not see, so I suspect that she will be helpful at this stage (September!).

When we notify people of acceptances, we need to ask about time conflicts. We will figure out the LSA conflicts ourselves (we will do our scheduling after the LSA does their scheduling), but people might have other conflicts - e.g., can't be there until Saturday; won't be there on Sunday.

The LSA schedule was posted around September 15 last year. We worked on our schedule following that, but after we heard from people about time conflicts. It looks like I put a draft of the program together after September 23, once we had heard back from people about whether they would be able to attend. There were continuing issues about withdrawals last year, and perhaps we need to have some discussion of that later on.

There was a lot of discussion about the student paper award and how to notify students about this. It looks like this was handled separately from the abstract acceptance.

Suggestions: *Work on the timetable so that it coincides with LSA's as much as possible.*

5. Report on new SSILA Program Administration position (Kohlberger);

Tasks

Organised Sessions:

1) Send out call for organised sessions
2) Receive proposals for organised sessions and pass them on to president and executive secretary

3) Send out notifications to authors of organised session proposals

Regular Session:

4) Set up abstract submission system (EasyChair)
5) Send out call for papers
6) Send out call for volunteer reviewers
7) Send reminders of abstract deadline
8) Check that everyone who submitted an abstract is an active SSILA member
9) Check conflicts of interest after submissions were assigned to reviewers
10) Send abstracts to reviewers
11) Send reminders of review deadline
12) Send out notifications to authors of abstracts
13) Ask for confirmation that authors are planning to attend the annual meeting

Meeting organisation

14) Check meeting schedule as proposed by president
15) Liaise with LSA regarding the number of conference rooms required
16) Re-format meeting schedule so that it conforms to the LSA Handbook format and make a list of short abstracts; send all of this to LSA organisers
17) Find chairs for all sessions
18) Keep track of cancellations and changes to the meeting schedule
19) Prepare daily updates of the programme to be sent out during the annual meeting
20) Prepare yearly report for the executive committee meeting

Report on execution of tasks in 2017

Note: Shortly after taking up this position, I had a series of personal setbacks and losses which required me to leave academia for the year. Unfortunately, this meant that some of the tasks listed above were executed later than would have been ideal, and it also meant that I needed more support from the president and executive secretary than originally envisioned. Some of this year's shortcomings listed below were a result of these problems. However, these were circumstantial difficulties that should not pose a problem for this position in future years.

Organised sessions

1) The call for organised sessions was sent out through our mailing list, but it was not widely distributed on other channels. A recommendation for future years is to widen the distribution of the call to give potential new SSILA members the opportunity to consider submitting.
2) No issues or recommendations.
3) There was some confusion as to who should keep in touch with authors of organised session proposals. I suggest for future years that all correspondence between organised

session authors and SSILA be done through the program committee administrator so that authors have a single SSILA contact, from the moment of submission onwards.

Regular session

4) EasyChair was used successfully for abstract submissions, reviews and notifications. Other abstract submission systems could be considered, but EasyChair still seems to be the best option for now in my view.
5) Like the call for organised sessions, the call for papers was sent out through our mailing list, but it was not widely distributed on other channels. I recommend widening the distribution in future years.
6) This was done by sending out a call through the SSILA mailing list as well as personally getting in touch with reviewers from previous years. After getting replies from volunteer reviewers, I set up a list of reviewers organised by name, area of expertise and geographic focus. This was fairly time-consuming to compile, but I think it was an important task because it facilitated the president's job of assigning abstracts to reviewers.
7) No issues or recommendations.
8) This was a very time-consuming task because our website did not have fully updated membership information. My recommendation is to liaise with the webmaster to see if this process can be semi-automated, and to make sure that we have updated membership information in future. Perhaps this task could be shared/delegated to another member of the executive team.
9) No issues or recommendations.
10) EasyChair was used for this. Some reviewers had issues submitting their reviews. A recommendation in future years is to send out more detailed instructions to reviewers on how to submit reviews through EasyChair.
11) No issues or recommendations.
12) EasyChair was used to send out notifications, but many problems were encountered regarding e-mails sent out directly through EasyChair. Some authors did not receive EasyChair notifications, or did not see them because they were picked up as spam by some e-mail servers. A possible solution to this in future years is to send out an e-mail through the SSILA mailing list every time an EasyChair notification is sent, encouraging people to get in touch with us if they did not receive the EasyChair e-mail.
13) No issues or recommendations.

Meeting organisation

14) We received many responses from presenters regarding changes to the programme, but they trickled in slowly and the programme had to be updated many times. A lot of the notifications we received were simple matters (like typos) that could have been corrected early on. In future, we should encourage authors even more to check the programme and notify us of issues early so that the programme is not updated too many times in the lead up to the meeting.

15) There was some confusion regarding which SSILA executive member should liaise with the LSA organisers. I suggest that the program committee administrator be the main point of contact with the LSA. That worked well this year.
16) This was a time-consuming task, but I cannot envision a way to automate it in future.
17) It was a time-consuming task to allocate chairs to sessions. In future, we should consider setting up a webpage or online document where people can assign themselves to sessions.
18) No issues or recommendations, just a reminder for future years that it is important to keep the LSA updated constantly so that the LSA Handbook is as accurate as possible.
19) I decided to do this spontaneously this year, but I think it might be something that would be useful to do in future years as well.
20) No issues or recommendations.

Conclusions

My impression is that having a (new) dedicated position to fulfil the tasks listed above is a positive addition to the SSILA executive structure. Most of the shortcomings this year had to do with my own personal struggles and were not reflective of problems with the role itself. I think if the recommendations above are followed, the tasks can be completed in an efficient way. Beyond the recommendations above, I do not think that the tasks of the program committee administrator need to be changed for future years.

Issues and Suggestions: *Martin feels that the Program Administrator job is fine for one person. Easy Chair suggestions -- 1) send parallel emails to SSILA members so if people don't get the EasyChair emails, they would be aware of it; 2) automating tasks - make sure that emails and membership information are current; 3) Chairs for sessions - set up a self-assignment google doc and people can sign themselves up; 4) how can we better deal with cancellations.*

6. Report on new election schedule and nomination procedures (Lillehaugen);

Report from SSILA Nominating Committee

I'm writing with a brief report on the Nominating Committee's experience this year. The committee consisted of myself (Brook Danielle Lillehaugen, chair), Mary Linn (chair for 2018), and Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada. This report is brief and consists of two main points. First, we were asked for feedback on the new calendar and timeline for nominations and voting. The new calendar posed no problems for us. Second, I would like the executive committee to be aware that we intentionally sought out Native, First Nations, and indigenous nominees. While we are very pleased with the outcome, we also want the EC to be aware that were several potential candidates that we could think of who were not members of SSILA. This might be an area for future discussion.

Suggestions*: How can we get more under-represented people to join SSILA? Discounts for registration, membership, and travel.*

7. Report on website, PayPal, Facebook, new fee structure (Hieber);

SSILA Online Presence in 2017
Prepared by Danny Hieber, SSILA Webmaster (webmaster@ssila.org)

Engagement with Members

● Website

	Member Type #	Member Status #
Executive Committee	7 unsubscribed	51
Regular	410	expired 32
Lifetime	22	active 363
News Editor	7	
Total	**446**	**446**

  ○ The high number of unsubscribed users is because we changed our rates last year, and all recurring memberships had to be canceled. Many of these people will resubscribe the next time they attend SSILA.

● Facebook
○ 385 people like the SSILA page
○ Each post is seen by ~100 people on average, and shared by a handful
○ Some posts were viewed by ~14,000!

Updates
● Beginning to track website and member statistics across years (visible on EC page)
● Started using a Content Delivery Network (fast downloads of files around the world)
● Starting to track Webmaster hours and tasks handled

Tasks
❏ PayPal information needs to be updated (coordinate with Ivy & Carolyn)
❏ SSILA.org email addresses
  ❏ Need to avoid @gmail.com addresses (these can and have been faked)
  ❏ Currently: Executive Secretary, Webmaster
  ❏ Possible: SSILA 2019 / Meetings, President, etc.
❏ Upload SSILA newsletters and bulletins
❏ Switch to better mailing list provider (e.g. Mailgun)
  ❏ Consider abandoning Linguist List listserv
    ● Appears to have been hacked
    ● Linguist List not responding to emails about it
  ❏ Should integrate with Wordpress
  ❏ Should allow for both general interest list AND members-only list
❏ Update committee members on website
❏ Solicit presentation materials for members-only presentation archive
❏ Claim second SSILA Facebook page:
  https://www.facebook.com/groups/57142424136/about/
  ❏ Contact Melissa Borgia-Askey (?)
❏ Do a complete member audit

❏ Need to remove News Editor role - no longer being used
        ❏ Consider a single Editor role, for managing site / Facebook content
❏ Document Webmaster tasks (even though Danny's not going anywhere anytime soon)

<u>Reminders</u>
● EC-only area of website: https://ssila.org/ec/
        ○ Overview of content
        ○ Anything else that should be added?
● Email Danny any interesting content you'd like posted (or if you'd like to write a post yourself)

Suggestions*: **Danny will provide us with a list of possible upgrades that would improve the website and make it easier to manage.***

8. **Report on student presentation awards** (Granadillo);

<u>Best student presentation award</u>
As of today (Friday 29th), we have 14 participants out of 26 initially identified. We still NEED judges. Need to do better next year: send out a call for judges with SSILA acceptances and an invitation to participate to student presenters. Link to google sheet works well for scheduling.

9. **Financial report** (MacKay)
        Technical issues in communication between PayPal info and website and notifications to MacKay - which affect IJAL, member logins, and notifications for renewal.

Financial Report - 2017
Carolyn MacKay, Executive Secretary/Treasurer

SSILA Financial Report 2017	ASSETS	EXPENSES
Chase balance 161110 **1/1/17**, 10,104.97 PayPal balance **1/1/17**, 845.60	10,950.57	
2017 Travel Awards Montoya 1/7/17 680; Fine, 1/8/17 810; Dinkel 1/7/17 1010		2500
2017 AV + conference rooms 1/30/17		2400
Webmaster stipend (DH 1/7/17)		1000
ES stipend (Doak 1/7/17 $1000, MacKay 2/17/17 1000)		2000
Program Administrator (2018)		
Accountant (Whisler 175, tax return)		175
EC meeting (Taff,copies 1/7/17 $46.17,)		46.17
CA Franchise Tax Board 5/10/17, $10		10
CA Secretary of State 9/22/17 $26		26

Hale Prize, Pat Shaw 1/7/17 500		500
Printing/postal 9/22/17, 6.59; 5/11/17, 22.71, 5/15/17 $20, 7/31/17 28.98		78.28
PayPal 19.99/month		239.88
BlueHost		395.64
IJAL (1/30/17), $740; 2/14/17, $27.18; 4/24/17, $299.58; 7/7/17 $212.09; 10/2/17, $581.45; 10/15/17, $39.59;		1899.89
Chase monthly fee 12, 12 (no longer charged)		24
Paypal account 161104 ($9700 transferred), still in PayPal 1292.39	10,956.30	
Dues and donations by check to Chase Bank $1262.39	1262.39	
Chase Current balance $10,014.10 still in PayPal 1386.28= 11400.38		
TOTAL	23,169.26	-11,294.86
CURRENT BALANCE -		**11,874.40**

Payments due to IJAL in January are not reflected in the Financial Report.
Included in the payments to PayPal are donations which amount to roughly $860.

Suggestions: *Send thanks for donations. Get Canadian non-profit status.*
Issues*: Inconsistent verification from PayPal. Members are not being notified of need for renewal at the appropriate times. Award the checks for the Travel Awards during the Business meeting and make it ceremonial.*

10. University of Nebraska Press - (MacKay) (Heather Stauffer, UNP provided an update on the UNP goals at the EC meeting)

UNP Report: The UNP representatives are Matthew Bokovoy and Heather Stauffer

Potential Goals: Setting up a committee of one or two series associate editors to work with a
        UNP Series Editor. Getting the backlog of existing prize winners through as soon as
        possible.

        Attachment: correspondence from UNP

University of Nebraska Press and the Haas Award
"This series is designed to attract, disseminate as widely as possible, and assist in the creation of the best possible book-length works that examine the indigenous languages of North and South America. Candidates of the series are winners of the Mary R. Haas Award, which is bestowed annually by the Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas for best monograph written that year. The series seeks to publish descriptive monographs based on significant fieldwork, as well as dictionaries and analyzed collections of texts."

UNP is enthusiastic about renewing the ties with SSILA and particularly with the Haas Award. They are willing to do whatever is necessary to reconstitute the series. The quotes below come from an email from Matthew Bokovoy, Senior Acquisitions Editor, Native American and Indigenous Studies. I, Carolyn, think we should proceed as quickly as possible to select a committee of one or two, to expedite the consideration of the existing Haas winning manuscripts.

1. UNP would like SSILA to select either an editor or team of editors to handle the Haas Prize Series. "Given the fact the series publishes the winning monographs, probably just one or at most two series editors would suffice, rather than a team, since the winners are pre-selected by the prize committee anyway. Someone that is good with communication and project logistics would be appropriate." (Matthew Bokovoy, Senior Acquisitions Editor, Native American and Indigenous Studies)

2. "SSILA can notify Parks of the plans to appoint new series editors, and let me know if you're amenable to that." I think that UNP should do this.

3. "I can see immediately we have a backlog of Haas Prize winners to publish. If this issue is affecting those scholars' career development, we can certainly be accommodating in getting the publication review process going right away if SSILA needs that. I will handle the projects myself in coordination with SSILA, until you appoint a new editor(s) to the series."

4. "As far as moving forward, if your committees want to reconstitute the series on a firmer footing, please simply move in that direction, and decide to select editors, and be in touch with the prize winners. We can get the series going again on a more regular and predictable schedule."

5. Draft a post that we could put on the SSILA website and distribute through email that explains what the process is for all submissions, but particularly for the Haas award winners. Perhaps Heather could help with this.

6. Here are the awardees since 2010. I don't think any have been considered by UNP.
Haas Award winners starting in 2010:

2017 No award
2016 Jaime Germán Peña (Winner), *A grammar of Wampis*
2016 Konrad Arkadiusz Rybka (Honorable Mention), *The linguistic encoding of landscape in Lokano*
2016 Lewis Lawyer (Honorable Mention), *A description of the Patwin language*
2015 Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada, *The Mako language: Vitality, grammar, and classification (published by Mouton)*
2014 No award
2013 No award
2012 Indrek Park, *A Grammar of Hidatsa*
2011 Rosa Vallejos, *A Grammar of Kokama-Kokamilla (published by Brill)*
2010 Lynda Boudreault, *A Grammar of Sierra Popoluca (Soteapanec, a Mixe-Zoquean Language*

Suggestions: *Confirm with the EC that we should continue a relationship with UNP. If so,then there are several things that arise. UNP should appoint the Series Editor. Should SSILA make suggestions? Could it be a UNP Series Editor and perhaps 1 or 2 Associate Editors? There should be a formal relationship with UNP. Matthew Bokovoy, Senior Acquisitions Editor, Native American and Indigenous*

Studies, said that he would edit the volumes of the existing winners that have not been published. They would like to expedite review and have contracts by summer. EC will discuss this via email and Skype to decide how to move ahead. Step 1. Discuss in EC about continuing a relationship with UNP. Step 2. If the decision is yes, encourage those whose dissertations have received the award to consider publishing them with UNP. Step 3. Other topics above.

11.   Andrew Garrett's proposal for a Language Archiving Award -- to highlight the importance of creating long-term archival materials that are accessible to all communities concerned, and to encourage others in the scholarly community to value such work as more comparable to analytic research.
Attachment: proposal from Andrew Garrett to Keren Rice

Proposal for an award for archiving corpus

Andrew Garrett wrote to me recently about whether SSILA would be interested in setting up a documentation award. Here is a little background based on what he told me (Keren Rice).

People at Berkeley have had conversations about the fact that important aspects of the work of a field linguist or a linguist who works on language documentation or with language communities tend to be evaluated as second-class work, or even not credited as research with respect to promotions and other things, but viewed as subsidiary parts of curricula, sometimes not included on the CV, and so on. They were thinking about things that could be done about this. They started thinking about having an award for corpus building and archiving. His interest grows out of things that he's seen at Berkeley, and about his observation that for many field linguists, the most important work that they will ever do may well be creating the corpus that they then use for their thesis and for much work that follows. They then began talking about having a prize, similar to the Haas Award, for the creation of a permanently archived, accessible, outstanding documentary corpus. While the DELAMAN Boas Award exists, it is for junior scholars and for an outstanding corpus of any language of the world.

Andrew then submitted the following to me for us to consider.

(I have used the name "X Award" because it is for SSILA to decide how to name it. Some possibilities could include calling it the **J.P. Harrington Award** or the **George Hunt Award** after people who created substantial archival collections. The idea for this award is partly inspired by DELAMAN's Franz Boas Award, but the latter is different in that it has world-wide scope and is given only to junior scholars.)

The purpose of the X Award is to highlight the importance of creating long-term archival materials that are accessible to all communities concerned, and to encourage others in the scholarly community to value such work as more comparable to analytic research. The X Award is presented to a researcher (from within academia or elsewhere) who has created an accessible documentary collection of materials relating to an indigenous language of the Americas. The collection so honored should ideally be linguistically or ethnographically rich, diverse in content (including some annotated or transcribed material), archived (and largely accessible) in a long-term preservation archive, well described (through collection-level and item-level metadata and a finding aid or descriptive overview), and potentially impactful for researchers or language learners. The X Award may be shared by multiple creators of a single collection (including, for example, academic and non-academic researchers, primary language

consultants, and collection curators).

Nominations may be made by anyone and should include:

- a letter of nomination identifying the nominee(s) (with curriculum vitae), describing the background of their work on the language in question, and the archival collection (with links to online content and metadata, and a finding aid or descriptive overview), and explaining its significance; and
- one supporting letter also explaining the significance of the archival collection.

Self-nominations are permitted.

BIO OF PERSON IT'S NAMED AFTER

Suggestions: *Present it at the Business meeting for acceptance in principle and work on the exact wording afterward. Questions that came up about what kinds of archiving deposits, how to determine accessibility, highlighting revitalization context. Be sure not to duplicate DELAMAN Boas Award. Include discussion of community benefits. Possibly a $500 award.*

Based on the EC discussion, Keren asked Andrew to make some revisions, and the following was presented at the Business Meeting.

This award highlights the importance of creating long-term archival materials that are accessible to all communities concerned, including heritage and language communities as well as scholarly communities; and is meant to encourage others in academia to value such work as more comparable to analytic research. It is presented to one or more researchers (from any community) who have created an accessible documentary collection of materials relating to an indigenous language of the Americas. The collection so honored should have as many of the following characteristics as possible:

- It should be linguistically or ethnographically rich.
- It should be diverse in content, including some annotated or transcribed material.
- It should be archived in a long-term preservation archive.
- Its content should largely be accessible to all stakeholders, including heritage and language communities as well as scholarly communities.
- It should be well described through collection-level metadata, item-level metadata, and a finding aid or descriptive overview.
- Its content should be potentially impactful for language learners, language maintenance, language teaching, and scholarly research.

This award may be shared by multiple creators of a single collection (including, for example, academic and non-academic researchers, primary language consultants, and collection curators).

Nominations may be made by anyone and should include:

- a letter of nomination identifying the nominee (with curriculum vitae), describing the background of their work on the language in question, and the archival collection (with links to online content and metadata, and a finding aid or descriptive overview), and explaining its significance and ; and
- one supporting letter also explaining the significance of the archival collection.

Self-nominations are permitted.

12. Civility policy
Attachment: new LSA policy
Consideration: Do we want to establish a subcommittee to draft a SSILA policy?

CIVILITY POLICY

The LSA annual meetings, Linguistic Institutes, and other LSA-sponsored events are convened for the purposes of professional development and scholarly and educational interchange in the spirit of free inquiry and free expression. Consequently, all forms of incivility and harassment are considered by the LSA to be serious forms of professional misconduct.

The following Civility Policy outlines expectations for all those who attend or participate in LSA events. **It reminds LSA participants that all professional academic ethics and norms apply as standards of behavior and interaction at these events.**

1. Purpose

The LSA is committed to providing a safe and welcoming conference environment, protecting our community's rich diversity of race, gender, sexual orientation, professional status, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, age, and religion.

"Participant" in this policy refers to anyone present at LSA events, including staff, contractors, vendors, exhibitors, venue staff, LSA members, and all other attendees.

2. Expected Behavior

All participants at LSA events are expected to abide by this Civility Policy in all venues including ancillary events and official and unofficial social gatherings, and to abide by the norms of professional respect that are necessary to promote the conditions for free academic interchange.

Participants who witness potential harm to another conference participant are encouraged to be proactive in helping to mitigate or avoid that harm.

3. Unacceptable Behavior

Unacceptable behaviors include:

- Coercive, intimidating, harassing, abusive, derogatory or demeaning actions or speech. Note that the latter is distinct from vigorous, reasoned disagreement compatible with norms of civil behavior.

- Prejudicial actions or comments, related to a person's identity or group membership, that coerce others, foment broad hostility, or otherwise undermine professional equity or the principles of free academic exchange. Relevant identities include (but are not limited to) those defined by race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, physical or cognitive disability, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, age, national or regional origin, or religion.

- Persistent and unwelcome physical contact or solicitation of emotional, sexual or other physical intimacy, including stalking.

Adopted by the LSA Executive Committee, December 18, 2017

Suggestions: *There was agreement that SSILA needs its own civility policy. Tania Granadillo volunteered to develop the Civility Policy for SSILA. It will be voted on during the normal election process.*

13. **Bylaws revision:**

Attachment: Proposed revisions following from structural changes

BYLAWS OF
THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF THE INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES OF THE AMERICAS

Adopted Dec. 5, 1981; amended Dec. 1986; amended Jan. 2008, amended Jan. 2012

Article 1. *Name and Object.*

1. This Society shall be known as THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF THE INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES OF THE AMERICAS.
2. Its object shall be the advancement of the scientific study of the indigenous languages of North, Central, and South America.

Article 2. *Membership and Dues.*

1. Any person may become a member by payment of dues. Only members may vote and hold office in the
Society.
2. On or before January 31 of each year, each member shall pay to the Executive Secretary an annual fee
as dues, in an amount fixed by the Executive Committee. A member who does not pay dues within the time prescribed shall forfeit the rights of membership (as hereinafter specified) while default continues; but these rights shall be restored on the payment of all arrears. A member whose dues are in arrears on January 31 of the second year shall be automatically dropped from the rolls of the Society.

Article 3. *Officers and Committees.*

1. The Officers shall be a President, a Vice President, and an Immediate Past President. The Vice President shall have the additional title of President-Elect.
2. ~~Beginning in January 2009,~~ The President shall serve for two years and shall take office at the conclusion of the annual meeting held in alternate years. Following the end of his or her term, the President shall serve an additional two years as Immediate Past President. The President shall preside at meetings of the Society and of the Executive Committee, shall appoint such nonelective committees as may be required, and shall be empowered to make an interim appointment to fill a vacancy in any office until elections can be held.

18

3. ~~The Vice President who takes office in January 2008 shall serve for one year. Beginning in January 2009~~ The Vice President shall serve for two years. The Vice President shall perform the functions of the President in the latter's absence and shall succeed to the presidency at the end of his or her term as Vice President.

4. The Executive Committee shall appoint a member of the Society to serve as Executive Secretary, and another member of the Society to serve as Editor, each for a term of three years. These appointments may be renewable. The responsibilities of the Executive Secretary shall include keeping the records of the transactions of the Society and acting as the chief fiscal officer of the Society. The responsibilities of the Editor shall include editing the Society's Newsletter and other publications. Both the Executive Secretary and the Editor may be assigned further responsibilities by the President and the Executive Committee. Add: The Executive Committee sitting ex officio or a subcommittee appointed by them shall constitute the Program Committee. The Program Committee shall have at least three members. The Program Committee shall have responsibility for the scholarly content of the Society's meetings and for recommending general policies on the form of the meetings to the Executive Committee for action. Should we appoint an Editor to be in charge of posts on the website and Facebook posts? We need someone to take over those duties.

> **Commented [rice@chas1]:** We need something here about the new position that Martin now occupies. I think we should work on the wording here, and figure out just what the needs are, what needs to be in the by-laws, and what can just happen.

5. There shall be an Executive Committee, composed of the President, the Vice President, the Immediate Past President, and three other members of the Society, one of the three being elected each year to serve for three years and to be ineligible for immediate reelection. The Executive Secretary and the Editor shall be ex-officio members of the Executive Committee, without vote. The Executive Committee shall have power to take any action that the Society itself could take, but all its acts must be reported to the Society at the next annual meeting. A quorum of the Executive Committee shall consist of no fewer than four of its voting members. The Executive Committee shall meet at least once annually, at the time of the annual meeting of the Society, and may also meet at other times upon the call of the President. The Executive Secretary may ask the Executive Committee to vote upon specific questions by mail, and shall do so at the request of any member of the Committee. If four or more members of the Committee shall vote by mail for or against any measure thus submitted, that vote shall be decisive. The Executive Committee shall nominate at least two persons for each position to be filled on the Nominating Committee.

> **Commented [rice@chas2]:** We need to think about what it means to be the editor; and the new program secretary should be included here.

6. There shall be a Nominating Committee consisting of three members, one of them being elected each year to serve for three years. The senior member shall serve as chair. Each year, the Nominating Committee shall nominate at least one person for the at-large position to be filled on the Executive Committee, and in 2008, and in alternate years thereafter, shall also nominate at least one person for the position of Vice President.

7. A ballot shall be submitted to all members in good standing not less than two months in advance of the annual meeting. The ballot shall contain the nominees for the positions to be filled on the Executive Committee and the Nominating Committee, and in alternate years for the position of Vice President. The ballot shall allow for a vote against all nominees for a given office. In order to be elected, a nominee for a given office must receive a majority of those replies received by the Executive Secretary as of the announced date of the close of the election. If no nominee for a given office receives a majority of the votes cast, the office shall be filled by a special election at the next meeting of the Society.

8. The Executive Committee sitting *ex officio* or a subcommittee appointed by them shall constitute the Program Committee. The Program Committee shall have at least three members. reword The Program Committee shall have responsibility for the scholarly content of the Society's meetings and for recommending general policies on the form of the meetings to the Executive Committee for action.

Article 4. *Meetings.*

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Society, at such time and place as shall be determined by the Executive Committee. A quorum shall consist of those present at the meeting, as determined by the Secretary.

2. The Executive Committee may call special meetings of the Society.

3. Titles and descriptions of papers to be read before the Society must be approved for presentation before-hand by the Program Committee.

Article 5. *Activities.*

1. The Society shall publish a Newsletter, which shall be distributed to all members in good standing. Omit??

2. The Society may engage in other activities in furtherance of its goals, by action of the Executive Committee or through a motion adopted at a meeting of the Society.

Article 6. *Ratification.*

1. These Bylaws shall be considered in force and binding upon the Society after approval by a meeting of the Society called for that purpose.

2. Upon adoption of these Bylaws the aforesaid meeting of the Society shall elect a President, Vice President, and Secretary-Treasurer, who shall serve in those offices until the regular annual meeting of the Society to be held the year following the one in which these Bylaws are adopted. It shall also elect three members to the Executive Committee, one to serve the same term as the Officers previously elected, the second to serve one additional year, and the third to serve two additional years. The Executive Committee shall then meet and appoint a Nominating Committee of three members, with terms of one, two, and three years, as described above for the Executive Committee.

Article 7. *Amendments.*

1. Any proposed amendment to these Bylaws must be submitted in writing to the Executive Secretary, signed by at least ten members of the Society in good standing. This will be submitted to the members at the time of the regular election of officers. An amendment must have the approval of two-thirds of the members voting.

Suggestions: *Get 10 people at the Business meeting to sign to update the By-Laws to reflect the current practice. Voting will take place during the normal election cycle.*

Someone to take over Facebook and website posts - perhaps 'Editor'?

14. Fund raising -- Mention SSILA goals for the funds. Highlight options for donations - general funds, travel awards, other awards. Get Canadian non-profit status.

We didn't get much past this point. Below are topics on the Agenda which were not really discussed.

15. Membership drive - Consult with LSA about featuring Sister Societies on their website. Recruit members from European organizations.

16. **Special sessions in 2019 and 2020**
	NSF submission for 2019 special session (New York City) -- see below under Equity and
Diversity.
	Work on special sessions for 2020 in New Orleans. Perhaps on Choctaw, Koasati,
Chitimacha, Tunica.

17. **Equity and Diversity**
	Attachment: Granadillo, Bischoff, and Riestenberg's NSF proposal

Shannon Bischoff as PI along with Tania and Kate Riestenberg submitted an NSF proposal in
September to fund a workshop for SSILA 2019 to include North and Latin American Indigenous
scholars and academics. Tania also plans to submit a proposal in February or April to SSHRC
(Canadian equivalent to NSF) along with Keren to fund Canadian participants and some other
Latin American scholars. Waiting to hear results from NSF to tweak this proposal.
The proposal requires some revisions, and Kate is working on them.

18. **Discussion of committee reports**
	Why so few Haas, Hale, and Golla submissions? What can we do to improve the number
of submissions? Should the EC make some nominations?

19. **Announcements, suggestions, comments, etc.**

There should be another EC meeting by Skype toward the end of January.

Adjourned at 9 AM.