Plains Anthropological Society
82nd Plains Anthropological Conference; Iowa City, Iowa
First Board of Directors Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, October 29, 2025, 5 pm Central; Microsoft Teams

Present: Matt Hill, Stephen Perkins, Brooke Morgan, Adam Wiewel, Warren Davis, Veronica Mraz, Andy Clark, Tyrel Iron Eyes, Jennifer Harty, Marcel Kornfeld, Dave Williams, Chris Johnston, Timothy Reed (virtual), Bill Billeck, Sarah Trabert (to discuss Student Paper Competition), Abigail (Abby) Fisher

Absent: Cody Newton, Carlton Shield Chief Gover, Gary Wowchuk, Allison Grunwald

1. **Welcome and Call to Order**
    a. Call to order at 6:02 pm

2. **Approval of the Agenda**
    a. Tyrel motion; Veronica 2nd; unanimously approved
    b. Chris would like to add an item to New Business (Timing of Future BOD meetings)

3. **Introductions**
    a. Go around the table (and screen) to introduce self for the benefit of new BOD members

4. **Conference Organizers Remarks (Hill/Doershuk)**
    a. Matt: Failed to mention last week that there will be an open house at the Iowa OSA. Over 400 registrants across both organizations. Have had around 12 in-person registrants, and will likely get more. All those help move the needle toward covering all expenses.
    b. Chris: The Iowa grant is partially based on room nights. For folks not staying at The Graduate, do we need to track down information from those folks? That could be a couple thousand dollar difference.
        i. Matt: Thought about that as well, and will touch base with our POC.
    c. Chris: FYI, all finances are going through us. If we lose money, MAC will pay us back. If we make money, it'll be split. Kudos to Matt and John, this has been well-run and thought out. The Zeffy platform alone has saved us a few thousand dollars. Onsite will have fees through PayPal.
    d. Andy: Been talking with Matt, John, and Eve Hargrave (MAC President)—all awards will be presented at the business meeting. At the banquet, we'll have opportunities to discuss a few things. John will give introductions and thanks. Eve will present MAC's distinguished service and student

award winners. Andy will acknowledge PAS DSA award recipients. And Matt will introduce the speaker. At Business Meeting, give awards during their spot in the reports spaces. Outgoing BOD members will also be discussed at the Business Meeting, not the banquet.

   i. Chris: Resolutions?
   ii. Andy: Cody will read them at the Business Meeting, then will work with MAC on the in memoriam to make sure everyone is recognized and acknowledged.

e. Matt: Once again, need to acknowledge Chris and all of his contributions and help.

5. Officers' Reports

a. President's Report (Clark)
   i. Still working on it. Been thinking about how much national politics are affecting everyone we work with, and it's shocking how much every sector relies on federal funding. This type of impact really speaks to the need of advocacy: how we reach the public, how we work with other societies, maintaining and supporting community. We're a member supported and member driven society—it's all dependent upon us to get the work done: journal contributions, conference contributions, serving on the BOD/committees. Benefits of serving the membership is completely tied to the membership numbers, which directly contributes to how well we do financially.
   ii. Need to thank Bill for getting articles, preparing a lot of publications, catching up the journal, and getting things into a good spot for Marcel and Allison. Marcel and Allison have good ideas in terms of getting the word out about the journal.
   iii. Also, have the Taylor and Francis contract negotiations coming up. One issue: is 2025 end based on how many issues we've put out (all of 2025), or is it purely calendar based? Do we want to stay with T&F?
   iv. Sent out the SAA Partner Professional Organization application earlier today. Getting involved would give us a good foot on the ground for interactions and guiding how the SAA does things nationally.
   v. Back to advocacy: we can all be advocates for how we promote archeology and how we fit into the larger public and our political leaders. We need to show how we're beneficial to them.
   vi. Chris: In terms of advocacy, 100% agree. PAS is a 501c3, so we have to walk that line carefully. We can share and promote materials, but

we have to follow certain rules and guidelines to ensure we're complying with laws and regs.

1. Andy: Thinking advocacy in terms of us as members—what can we do as members of the PAS to make the public more interested and supportive of us as a society.

b. Treasurer's Report (Johnston)

   i. Sent out late yesterday. Like to wait til the end to get the most up-to-date numbers

   ii. Have a short presentation to show at the Business Meeting.

   iii. 2024 was a good year, financially, in large part due to Rapid City conference in 2023. We operate on a cash basis, which relates to when money enters account. We also didn't have a lot of expenses in 2024 (editor's stipend, and journal expenses, in part), but have seen those expenses in 2025.

   iv. Membership #s (and, therefore, revenue) are down significantly.

      1. Andy: Partly due to delays in publications, which is a big component of membership.
      2. Chris: Agree, but also need to look at membership base and demographics. Where are Plains university programs? Those have typically brought a large membership base.
      3. Andy: Plea to push academic administrations to hire Plains positions to assist with this. There is a dwindling number of faculty working in the Plains, or Plains adjacent who have been members.
      4. Jennifer: Definitely seen decline in the numbers of Plains professors and their students compared to several years ago. Also, positions being cut in these programs and Plains professionals scrambling to find positions in tangential programs.

   v. 2025 is not done yet, obviously. Website upgrade costs on the books for 2025, along with other expenses that have hit this year. But, able to parse out the numbers to show where they all really play out. Will provide end of year report. Have a PAS checking account for conferences (no debit card). So able to see most of the expenses in near-real time. Lethbridge made around $7500 when all was said and done.

   vi. All that said, we're in a strong financial positions overall. Total net assets nearly $400,000. Ca. $148,000 in Roper Endowment, and ca. $155,000 in Plains Endowment. Cash-in-hand around $90,000.

   vii. Need to vote on this report, so recommendations:

            1. Do not complete a financial audit. They prepare reports that can easily be prepared without paying someone.
            2. Continue to update the Financial Handbook.
            3. Continue to monitor our investments.
            4. Work with Student Engagement Committee on how to disperse funds.
    viii. Andy: Thanks again, Chris, for everything.
    ix. Motion to approve report:
            1. Veronica motion; Abby 2nd. Unanimous approval

c. Editor's Report (Billeck)
    i. 5 issues printed, a 6th submitted. One big contributor to the success is 2 memoirs were submitted. Have enough content to get probably halfway through 2025 issues for Marcel and Allison.
    ii. Some issues at T&F working through the production process. Different personnel involved, some good and some not so good.
    iii. Already thinking about switching to digital.
    iv. T&F considering changing from page numbers to number of articles. They get money based on hits to articles, so they'll want a minimum number of articles. This could increase difficulty in staying on top of schedule.
    v. Encourage everyone to think about submitting something.
    vi. If you see papers at local, regional conferences, solicit them for submission to the journal.
    vii. Have heard from some folks who have ideas for memoirs, but they're hard to prepare.
    viii. Chris: Would articles issue be worth discussing in next contract negotiations?
            1. Bill: Yes.
    ix. Matt: Could we think about memoirs differently? Instead of chapters of a memoir, articles of a related topic?
            1. Bill: Sure. Consider invited sessions at conference to lead toward publications.
            2. Andy: Need to consider organizing Plains-centered session at SAAs each year that would/could lead to an issue. There are generally regionally-themed sessions ("mountains" in Denver, etc.)
            3. Chris: We could just organize and sponsor one. We were set up to do that in 2020, then things happened.
            4. Brooke: Would being a PPO help?

            a. Andy: Could help. Been discussing that with Chris Dore. Also brought up inviting SAAs to PAC for topics that cover a broader scale.
            b. Abby: Potential to publish could be a lure to these sessions. There will be an editor or someone on the Editorial Committee in attendance to consider papers.
    x. Motion to approve report:
        1. Tyrel motion, Chris 2nd; unanimously approved

6. **Standing Committee Reports** (updates or follow-up discussion from October 23 meeting)
    a. Archives (Williams)
    b. Bylaws (Mraz)
    c. Conference and Conference Handbook (Johnston)
    d. Distinguished Service Award (Mraz)
        i. Going to present at Business Meeting, then acknowledged at the Banquet
    e. Ethics and Inclusion (Wowchuk)
    f. Native American Student Award (Iron Eyes)
        i. Presenting to one student at Business Meeting, but 2nd student will not be making it.
    g. Sensitive Image Policy (Gover)
        i. Andy: Format for tomorrow's forum. Essentially, we're trying to get feedback. Asked Carlton to discuss the history of the Committee, how the statement draft was arrived at, etc.
        ii. Chris: Printed copies to provide attendees?
            1. Andy: Good idea.
            2. Veronica: Can do it at the office.
        iii. Andy: one of us will read the policy at the forum.
        iv. Chris: Shared current feedback from the website form already with Andy and Carlton.
            1. Andy: Keep it open for a bit after so attendees can provide feedback.
        v. Andy: Then, how do we take the feedback and move forward. Don't need membership vote on it. It's a BOD policy. Maybe something for the Spring meeting: gather the feedback and bring a recommendation to that meeting. That also means the Committee will need to remain through the Spring meeting.
        vi. Adam: Should someone be there to take notes?
            1. Dave and Brooke both volunteered. Won't record due to intimidation factor.

h. Nominations (Reed)
    i. 2025 election results (see FINAL 2025 Pre-Conference BOD meeting minutes for full details of the nomination and election process.
        1. The top 3 vote recipients for BOD seats: Warren Davis, Jennifer L. Harty, Matt E. Hill, Jr.
        2. The top vote recipient for President-Elect: Brooke Morgan
    ii. Keep eyes open for potential nominees for next year and let Timothy know.

i. Resolutions (Newton)

j. Student Engagement (Perkins)
    i. Point out that early student posters (GRSLE session) will overlap with Sensitive Image Policy forum. Let them get started, then come through to judge about 2pm?
    ii. 17 total posters; 4 in GRSLE session, and 13 in general student poster session. Enough time in 2 hours to go through all the posters?

k. Student Paper Award (Trabert)
    i. 4 excellent grad student papers. No undergrads entered, which seems to be a recent trend. The 4 we received is around average for recent meetings.
    ii. This year worked with conference organizers to share that not all entries would receive complimentary banquet tickets. Only the winner(s) of the competition will receive tickets. This is something we should plan on continuing moving forward.
    iii. Also like that we're announcing winners at the Business Meeting
    iv. <u>Andy</u>: the BOD packet does say single-author papers only are accepted. Open discussion how to (re)create the policy in regard to multi-author papers. Andy's preference is to accept only single-author papers moving forward. This year, there is a two-author paper, and included in the application was an explanation about the specific work that the student did.
        1. <u>Sarah</u>: Tasked with recreating the paper competition policy for the new website. Reached out to folks who have been involved in the past. Did decide to accept multi-author papers this year. For this year's multi-author, the roles and positions are highly common in their area and the student likely would not have submitted if the other authors weren't included. There may be multiple reasons why a student may have to submit a paper with multiple authors.

2. Chris: To be clear, we're talking about student-professor papers vs student-plus-multiple collaborators? Andy: Either.
3. Stephen: Can submit a paper to give at the conference outside of the competition. Looks good on the CV. Posters typically have multiple authors.
4. Andy: This came up at OKC conference, and a student with co-author was dismissed but invited to publish. It was a fantastic paper, and we found out that the student did all the work, but there wasn't a formal policy addressed.
5. Bill: Given the field has made students come to rely on technical skills to publish, we should allow multiple authors but ask for verification that the student has done the lead work, prepared the paper. Have one student clearly explain that they did the lead work
6. Abby: Maybe have co-authors also write a letter indicating that the student led the work.
7. Andy: What about question of percentage?
    a. Veronica: Like a minimum of 75%?
    b. Andy: Or have it completely written by the primary author with contributions by other authors.
    c. Brooke: Specific technical sections by contributions.
8. Sarah: Posters are a different animal so having multiple authors makes sense. Have asked advisors for letter or input on the student's work. There are other eyes on the paper, even if the student is doing on the work.
9. Matt: Like the posters, if we kept to single-author, it would be much more difficult to get new submissions. Especially with having the system of having an advisor justify. Also, adding a % makes it difficult—how do you determine 75% vs 85%?
10. Veronica: With how interdisciplinary research is, there would be difficulties getting submissions.
11. Andy: Sounds like we have a plan that is essentially how things are going this year (having a letter explaining what the student did signed by other authors).
12. Stephen: Like having the letter, and also have advisor provide input about the contributions. Adam: It has been a policy? Stephen: Not always. Seen a paper presented that a student has never seen before.
13. Jennifer: Would we provide a template letter?

a. Sarah: If we want to involve the co-authors and have them sign off, we'd need to create a template. Good idea since everyone's on the same page, but also tricky politically in getting an advisor or other co-authors to sign off.
b. Jennifer: Things won't come in equally, so will it be up to the committee to make a determination about what is acceptable in terms of sign-offs?
c. Andy: Like what Bill said to have the student explain what they did and have the advisor/co-authors sign-off. Putting a form together should be left to the Committee. Leave the Board out of it so things don't get over analyzed and lost.
d. Sarah: Can ask students additional questions if the information isn't there initially.

14. Marcel: Committee decide on the form. Advantage of the form is comparisons across students. If all students have to prepare a short essay, they'll be all over the place. Form makes comparisons easier.
15. Chris: We're in a good spot with Sarah leading things to get continuity. Also, the committee should get together and decide, then bring to the BOD, perhaps in the Spring meeting, to present what they've come up with.
16. Adam: Need to be aware during posters that sometimes a co-author, advisor, or grad student may dominate the presentation instead of the undergrad.
17. Chris: Good opportunity to have paper and poster policies come into alignment.
18. Bill: Right now, can we include the multiple-author paper in the competition?
    a. Sarah: Yes, based on the current document that was shared to potential applicants.
19. Andy: One other question—one paper has already been submitted for publication?
    a. Yes, with another journal.

l. Student Poster Competition (Perkins)
   i. Will stand up at the Business Meeting and announce poster winners.
   ii. Abby: Do we accept non-students on posters?
      1. Stephen: We'll have to, given advisors on many of the posters.

    2. <u>Chris</u>: Guidelines on the website say all authors must be currently enrolled full- or part-time grad or undergrad students.
    3. <u>Adam</u>: Question of disqualification will occur if the advisor does all the presenting.
    4. <u>Chris</u>: Has been discussed previously, as with papers, that the posters are collaborative efforts, and students might not know that they couldn't or shouldn't include their advisor on the bill.
    5. <u>Abby</u>: This year, when judging, be explicit in asking levels of involvement.
    6. <u>Chris</u>: Moving ahead, the respective committees need to meet and come up with cohesive, consistent guidelines and policies. Also recommend that participation in poster competition is something to mark when registering for the conference.

m. Social Media/Webmaster/Website (Williams)

n. Membership (Fisher)
   - i. This year's membership number is exactly equal to last year's membership: 340
   - ii. 15 more student members currently than last year. Student retention is always an issue, as they join for the conference in their state then don't renew.
   - iii. <u>Veronica</u>: One membership added in person at the conference so far.
   - iv. Once the website updates were completed, things have improved a lot.
   - v. As current journal issues are arriving, folks are going online and realizing they need to renew.
   - vi. We also have to universally accept that there's less money to send folks to conferences, there are fewer professors overall. Numbers in membership are a general reflection of the state of the world.
   - vii. Decrease in Canadian memberships, given state of political climate in the US, as well as because of the standard drop-off in membership rates from the host state/province. We always see a boost in membership numbers from those locations in conference years, and typically see a drop from those locations in the following year.

7. Ad Hoc Committee Reports

a. Donna C. Roper Research Fund (Billeck)

i. Bill: Chris did a great job investing the money.
ii. Chris: Last year, we ended the year at $132K.
iii. Bill: We're at $148K now. The award from a couple of years ago is still pending (U of Iowa).
iv. Matt: Recommend the committee specifies in the award notice that overhead will not be included in the future.
v. Bill: This year, we had one application that's been reviewed and will be supported. It's for about $2500 for radiocarbon dating.
vi. Andy: This will be announced at the Business Meeting.
vii. Chris: Does the committee want to pull any of the gains out of the fund, or leave it invested?
    1. Bill: Probably leave it invested—let it ride!

b. Financial Review (Johnston for Mitchell)
    i. Mark [Mitchell] looked at the books. No issues.
c. Editorial Committee (Clark)
    i. Going to keep it around. Committee is Andy, Chris, and Bill, and plan to add Marcel and Allison to it.
    ii. Primary issue is Taylor and Francis contract.
    iii. Andy: Let's meet in the next month or so.
    iv. Chris: It expires at the end of the 2025 issue. Is that 4th issue of 2025, or end of calendar year 2025? Need to find out from T&F.
    v. Chris: Willing to continue to advise regarding financial impact, but probably don't need to be in a bunch of meetings. One benefit of staying with T&F is the amount of royalties coming in.
    vi. Andy: Anyone opposed to T&F?
        1. Chris: Only if someone is worried about the click-based model
        2. Matt: Any other vendors are likely along the same lines these days.
d. Endowment Committee (Johnston)
    i. Net gain overall on Roper fund; at about $148K now. Have dispersed about $40K since its inception.
    ii. Stephen: Do we use a financial advisor?
        1. Chris: Yes, Wells Fargo Financial Advisors.
    iii. PAS Endowment at $160K (really, $155K due to $5K coming out for Student Travel Fund)
    iv. For new BOD members: Both funds are in moderate growth funds. They're slightly more aggressive and subject to market fluctuation. They did take a dive a while back, but ground has been made up.

8. Old Business

a. Sensitive Image Policy
    i. See notes above in Section 6g.
b. SAA Affiliated Society
    i. Andy: Last year, talked with SAA President, Chris Dore, who has a big goal of engaging more with other societies and organizations. Their other program (CoAS [Council of Allied Societies]) is primarily for avocational groups. Brand new program announced at the last annual meeting: Professional Partner Organization (PPO). The new program gives us: a website badge as an affiliated society; a copy of *Archaeological Record* (either digital or print); copy of the Govt Affairs Committee newsletter that can be distributed to all PAS members; PAS recognition in *Notes from HQ* electronic newsletter and in *SAA Archaeological Record*; one complimentary *Foundation Skills Seminar* group registration per membership year ($89 value); one discounted *Deeper Digs Seminar* group registration per membership year ($139 value); and invitation for designated PPO representative to an annual Leaders in Archaeology breakfast and roundtable discussion at SAA Annual Meeting.
        1. Abby: Is there any sort of recognition of the members?
            a. Brooke: Get a ribbon for your badge at the SAA Annual Meeting.
        2. Andy: It's a fledgling program and gets us a seat at the table to discuss our needs, goals, and overlap with SAA. Chris Dore's attempt is to get other societies to work together. Getting involved will help get the bigger picture across to SAA Board.
        3. Marcel: If it's the same as COAS, we may get a table at the SAA annual meeting, which is a $500 charge.
    ii. Andy: Recommend giving them $100 to join this for a year to see how it goes, if the benefits are there.
    iii. Andy: One thing we can present to SAA—their journal is bigger, but ours gets published faster. If there is a quality article for *American Antiquity* that's Plains-related, we could publish it sooner.
    iv. Andy: One other thing—have to follow SAA code of ethics.
    v. Marcel: What other societies are represented at the breakfast?
        1. Andy: ACRA, California Archeological Society, East Asian society, SEAC; efforts to bring in more Latin American communities
        2. Marcel: Would recommend not just trying for a single year, but shoot for 5 years. Give it time to settle in, find its footing.

We're coming in on the ground floor, so see what it does for us.

3. Andy: Worth getting in now and may be able to have more voice in how the group grows and develops.
4. Tyrel: Worried about committing long-term for future BOD members who may think we're locked into it permanently, or aren't bought in.
    a. Brooke: Maybe commit for 3 years to get through term.
    b. Chris: Great point. Encourage all BOD members to review old minutes to know what's been discussed, how decisions have been made.
5. Chris: A lot of it seems top-down and "look what we can do for you" (from SAA). Do we want to be aligned with SAA on everything, as an anthropological org (not just archeo org). But do agree that it's worth exploring.
6. Andy: One big question is "What does this do for us?" The only way to know is to try it out.

vi. Abby: Motion to submit an application to the SAA PPO org for the next 3 years, pending future BOD President and Board review for continued enrolled after that 2028.

1. Tyrel 2nd.
2. Aye: Stephen, Bill, Adam, Veronica, Andy, Tyrel, Abby, Dave, Timothy.
3. Chris abstained.

c. Conference Code of Conduct Updates

i. Andy: Still working on language. May have overly complicated things, but on the right path now.

ii. Adam: There hadn't been a communication mechanism previously, and we solved that.

iii. Chris: One thing that's been brought up by membership—Code of Conduct mentions that we have to acknowledge if someone has been found guilty of a Title IX infraction. And there's not a clear process for appeals to that acknowledgement if that individual desires to attend a future meeting. Is the acknowledgment in perpetuity? Or does it lapse?

9. New Business

a. Student Travel Award

i. Chris: This award grew out of the idea of undergrads not necessarily having support to attend meetings. Grad students typically have mechanisms. Some applications this year and in previous years have been eye-popping about what students think we can support (i.e., several thousand dollars). The committee needs help too. Think about a cap to the max amount of the award—here's a bit to help alleviate the cost.

- ii. Marcel: Historical Context—professor at USD requested money from university. The pool of money was equally distributed to students (i.e., $50-100 each).
- iii. Stephen: Higher confidence comes in applications from professors/advisors who have multiple students coming and can be handed the money to distribute accordingly.
- iv. Chris: What about the single student who doesn't have an advisor coming to support them?
- v. Matt: Part of the issue is that the committee has to decide based on the request how much to really give (i.e., when students request a bunch, only giving them some that's available)
- vi. Andy: Continue like we did this year, where there's a max total amount to distribute across all applications.
- vii. Abby: Do they have to show what they spent money on?
    1. Chris: They get a check when they arrive.
- viii. Abby: Like the idea of giving money only to those presenting a paper or poster.
    1. Chris: Historically, the idea was to give money to get students to come so that they can experience what a conference is like without the expectation of having to present.
- ix. Chris: Advocating for Stephen to get some help from other BOD members to help come up with the definitions and parameters for what it means to apply for and receive funding to attend the conference.
- x. Abby: Who applies? Student or professor?
    1. Chris: Yes. Professor can apply for a group. Student can apply for themselves or group. Student needs to have advisor letter of support.
- xi. Matt: Financially, could the committee set a certain amount for each year?
    1. Chris: Last year was asked to pull out of the Endowment Fund a reasonable amount, considering the movement of the fund (more or less success = more or less available).

b. Future conference BOD meeting timing

i. Chris: Explore getting rid of Wednesday night meeting and moving toward what other orgs (like MAC) does and moving to a Thursday lunch meeting. We miss the early bird meeting by doing this, and being advocates of the society and speaking to membership. The conference BOD meeting should be the time to focus on the things we need to cover, not the committee reports, etc.
ii. Andy: Suggest that one pre-conference BOD meeting agenda items is developing an agenda for the BOD conference meeting. Reserve the conference meeting for the things we really need to talk about.
iii. Andy: Let's hammer out the details at the Spring meeting.
iv. Matt: This meeting has been the same as the pre-conference meeting. These meetings have always run long, and people have avoided running for the BOD because of this meeting.
v. Adam: The pre-meeting shouldn't be rushed. Some of the issues that come up in the conference meeting remain unclear because they come so late in the night.
vi. Andy: Will look at calendar and hammer out schedule for next meeting, then address this and set agendas then.

c. 2026 conference – Lincoln
    i. Dave: Update on Lincoln. At the Graduate in downtown Lincoln (where it was hosted in 2016). Considering field trip options. Thursday reception either Nebraska History Museum or Morrill Hall—leaning NHM for cost considerations.
d. 2027 conference – TBD
    i. Marcel: Talked to people at UWy & OSA. Laramie will officially put in an offer for 2027. Will present at the Business Meeting for membership vote and approval.
e. 2028 conference – Wichita State/SHSND?
f. 2029 conference – Wichita State/SHSND?
    i. Wichita State and SHSND both have new construction projects that will be done by 2028/2029, so conferences those years would highlight the construction and new exhibits.
    ii. Wichita would host, and Stephen would help from Oklahoma State University
    iii. Andy, Stephen, and Crystal will get together to discuss timing and preference with potential to present at the Business Meeting

10. Announcements

a.

11. Adjournment

a. Motion to adjourn: Abby, Veronica 2^{nd}. Unanimously approved.
b. Adjourn at 9:30pm