

Minutes: 2019 Steering Committee and Constituent Organization Board Meetings (Utrecht)

Originally compiled by Brian Croxall and Maciej Eder, ADHO Secretariat, and Sara Sikes, ADHO Treasurer. Edited by Maciej Eder and Brian Croxall. Approved by the Steering Committee on 23 October 2019.

Voting representatives of Constituent Organizations

- aaDH, 1 vote: Paul Millar
- ACH, 2 votes: Matthew K. Gold, Kathleen Fitzpatrick
- centerNet, 1 vote: Laura Mandell
- CSDH/SCHN, 1 vote: Susan Brown
- DHASA, 1 vote: Juan Steyn
- EADH, 3 votes: Barbara Bordalejo, Elisabeth Burr, Øyvind Eide
- Humanistica, 1 vote: Martin Grandjean
- JADH, 1 vote: Kiyonori Nagasaki
- RedHd, 1 vote: Isabel Galina
- TADH, 1 vote: Chao-Lin Liu

Attendance: officers, committee chairs, CO representatives

(and identifying initials for these minutes)

- Chair: Karina van Dalen-Oskam – **KDO**
- Secretaries: Brian Croxall – **BC**, Maciej Eder – **ME**
- Treasurer: Sara Sikes – **SS**
- Deputy Treasurer: Jarom McDonald – **JM** (remote)
- Admissions Cmte Chair: Harold Short – **HS**
- Awards Cmte Chair: Micki Kaufman – **MK**
- Communications Cmte Chair: –
- Conference Coordinating Cmte Chair: Diane Jakacki – **DJ**
- Infrastructure Chair: Christof Schöch – **CS**
- Ad-hoc Membership Committee: Matthew K. Gold – **MGo**
- MLMC Chair: Maurizio Lana – **ML**
- Publications Cmte Chair: Ashley Sanders Garcia – **ASG**
- SIG Liaisons: Zoe Borovsky – **ZB**
- aaDH rep: Paul Millar – **PM**
- ACH reps: Matthew K. Gold – **MGo**, Kathleen Fitzpatrick – **KF**
- centerNet reps: Paul Arthur – **PA**, Laura Mandell – **LM**

- CSDH/SCHN rep: Susan Brown – **SB**
- DHASA rep: Juan Steyn – **JS**
- EADH reps: Barbara Bordalejo – **BB**, Elisabeth Burr – **EB**, Øyvind Eide – **OE**
- Humanistica rep: Martin Grandjean – **MGr**
- JADH rep: Kiyonori Nagasaki – **KN**
- RedHD rep: Ernesto Priani – **EP**
- TADH rep: Su-Bing Chang – **SBC** (Sunday only), Chao-Lin Liu – **CLL** (Tuesday only)

List of Decisions and Motions passed

- BB moves to approve the budget for 2019. LM seconds. 13-0 in favor.
- LM moves to accept Ikki Ohmukai and Taizo Yamada as the PC chairs for DH2021. PM Seconds. 12 for, 0 against, 1 vote of no opinion.
- SC votes to dissolve itself and incorporate COB. OE moves that this happens. FC seconds. 13-0 in favor.

All the motions voted by the Steering Committee (SC) were formally approved by the Constituent Organization Board (COB). Additionally, the COB put forward and approved the following motions:

- COB votes to approve the budget and other decisions the SC has made. LM moves. EB seconds. 10-0 in favor.
- SB moved to have an experimental open call for DH2023 hosts, which would include a two-stage process with letters of intent. MGo seconded. It was approved by a vote of 9-1.

- COB votes to keep SS on as Treasurer for another year. SB moves, EB seconds, 10-0 in favor.
- COB votes to keep BC on as EB Secretary for another year. SB moves, LM seconds, 10-0 in favor.
- COB appointed Leif Isaksen to a two-year term as Chair of the Executive Board.
- COB appointed MGo to a one-year term as President of the COB and EB to a one-year term as President-Elect of the COB.
- COB voted to approve the new Board of Stichting ADHO, with Leif Isaksen as President, BC as Secretary, and SS as Treasurer. The motion was approved by a vote of 10-0.

List of Action Items

- COB should consider using a subcommittee to implement changes to the Code of Conduct
- COB should determine how the COs will communicate to OUP about who their members are by sending in their data, properly formatted.
- COB should consider the question of membership management (see above)
- COB should consider the minimum disbursement policy.
- CCC should work on the details of how to waive conference fees for PC chairs, LOs, COB representatives, and committee chairs.
- COB should consider new governance structure and finances, which includes the implementation of the Minimum Service Fee model.
- COB should determine if the DH2020 budget can be approved at cost recovery for 650 participants rather than 500.
- COB and EB will consider recommendations from CCC for restructuring the committee.

- COB should clarify the process by which SIGs are approved.
- The Infrastructure Committee should set up a MediaWiki instance to manage the sharing of information regarding the implementation of CiviCRM.
- CCC will work with PC2020 to make requirements for Fortier Prize more clear for those submitting within ConfTool.
- CCC will work with the COB to decide what the letter of intent should contain and when it should be received.
- CCC will gather small group of PC chairs and LOs to talk about how to make the connection between PC chairs and LOs work more effectively, with an aim for making the change for DH2022.

Sunday, 7 July, 9.00-17.30

Location: De Utrechter, Vredenburg 40, 3511 BD Utrecht

ADHO Foundation Board: concomitant with the meeting of the ADHO SC

- OFFICERS PRESENT: Karina van Dalen-Oskam (President), Maciej Eder (Secretary)
- OFFICERS REMOTE: Jarom McDonald (Treasurer)

9.00 Coffee and greetings

9.30 Welcome and Introductions (KDO, 10 minutes)

9.40 Chair's report (KDO) (20 minutes)

Please see the [Chair's report](#).

KDO began her report by noting that the focus of the SC and the Officers over the last year was on governance issues. Her report draws attention to two other important issues facing ADHO: the Conference Code of Conduct and the functioning of committees. She indicated that these are

two issues that will need to be considered by the Constituent Organization Board (COB), which will be ADHO's new governing body.

Members of the SC suggested continuing to look for other organizations that may have Codes of Conduct and also asked whether KDO would be willing to continue to advise on the Code of Conduct following her term as Chair. She agreed. BB proposed organizing a subcommittee to consider the implementation of the suggestions for the Code of Conduct made in the Chair's report, and the SC decided that this should be an issue for the COB to consider.

10.00 Treasurer's report + ADHO Budget 2019 and 2020 (SS, 45 minutes)

Please see Treasurer's [report](#) and [budget](#).

The Treasurer presented her report and the budget for FY2020. She noted that since the meeting in Mexico City ADHO has changed its fiscal year from a July-June calendar to one that matches the calendar year. This will allow ADHO to make budgetary decisions based on real numbers (the previous year's income) rather than predictions of income, which had been our previous practice. This should also help us alleviate points in any given year when the ADHO accounts are almost empty, such as around the conference when there are a lot of expenses that ADHO must cover or underwrite.

The income generated by *DSH* in 2018 was approximately 150k GBP, which was an increase of 9% over the previous year. After OUP took its costs for producing the journal off the top, the total profit was ~127k GBP. After OUP's 30% share of the profits, the income ADHO received in 2019 from the 2018 *DSH* was 89,896 GBP.

Institutional and consortia-based subscriptions continue to make up 75-80% of this income. The other monies come from individual subscriptions to *DSH*, open-access fees, membership-only fees to one or more COs, a process which OUP continues to help most of the COs manage. OUP does not receive a cut of these membership-only fees.

SS proposed a budget for 2020 of approximately €136k, which is €11k more than 2019. Some notable changes in the budget include increased funds for web infrastructure due to the need to improve the ADHO server infrastructure; improving the *DHQ* publication platform; funds for *Humanités numériques*.

SS reviewed the current model that ADHO uses to fund disbursements to the different COs.

- Step 1: Assign all institutional and consortia income from *DSH* to ADHO
- Step 2: Assign all individual and joint membership income proportionally to COs based on that CO's share of total members
- Step 3: Determine ADHO's yearly expenditures

- Step 4: Pay the expenditures from the amount in step 1 and distribute what's left over among all COs based on numbers of members as per the OUP geographical report.

At some point in the future, this model will change if/when we implement the Minimum Service Fee Model that was adopted at the 2018 SC meeting in Mexico City. In this model, money would go to the individual COs first and then each CO would remit an amount to ADHO. This remitted amount or rate would be determined by the COB.

Based on the current disbursement model, the 2019 disbursements, which are based on the 2018 income from OUP, to the COs will be the following:

- EADH: 8,875 GBP
- ACH: 9,526 USD
- CSDH/SCHN: 4,404 CAD
- aaDH: 4,810 AUD
- JADH: 409,748 JPY
- CenterNet: 3,385 USD
- Humanistica: 3,000 Euro
- TADH: 105,080 TWD
- DHASA: 47,737 ZAR

These disbursements will be made shortly after the 2019 conference. Additionally, RedHD will be provided with a €3,000 goodwill disbursement. Disbursements to COs continue to make up the bulk of the ADHO budget.

SS indicated that there has been an ad-hoc policy in place for a number of years that guarantees each CO a minimum disbursement of €3,000. She suggested that the SC and COB consider the viability of this policy, especially as ADHO is presented with proposals for other COs. A discussion ensued about the history of this policy, its goals, and its impact on various smaller COs.

OE and CS reminded the SC that EADH members often join through their AOs rather than directly through OUP and therefore the numbers may not reflect the real size of the membership. That said, each CO can send its membership information directly to OUP for inclusion in such numbers.

A discussion also ensued about efforts to move away from OUP's membership management system. That system is free for each CO to use and may enable some COs to spend less resources on membership management. At the same time, the system is cumbersome and many members have difficulty renewing their memberships. For this reason, DHd has been exploring the use of CiviCRM for membership management. DHd's estimate for implementing a CiviCRM instance within Drupal was €12k, and ADHO had previously committed €4k toward these costs. CS indicated that while work had been slowed by the two server crashes the software is installed on a test instance and that DHd is deciding how to map the fields and model the data. Since the data they will be using will be sensitive (payments, personal details, etc.), DHd believed it was important to work with a professional to implement everything. They are creating documentation as they go, and CS proposes setting up a MediaWiki instance to manage the sharing of information. Other COs are also interested in piloting CiviCRM, and consideration was given to whether ADHO should set aside additional money that COs could apply to use along the same model as DHd, where ADHO contributes up to one-third of the cost of the implementation. SS advised that this would require recalculating the FY2020 budget and that it may be wise to consider spreading such an investment across several years. KDO suggests that the COB will have to consider the question of membership management, as well as the minimum disbursement policy.

Following all the discussion, BB moved to approve the budget for FY2019. LM seconded, and it was approved by a vote of 13-0. The budget for FY2020 would be considered at the second meeting, following any changes the SC requested during the rest of its meetings.

10.45 Short break

11.00 Conference reports (45 minutes)

DH2019 Local Organizers

DH2019 local organizers Joris van Eijnatten (**JvE**) and Franciska de Jong (**FdJ**) presented their report (see the [written version](#)). They stressed that this year's conference is the biggest so far, with 1,063 registered participants. A Gold Sponsor has been involved (Gale), as well as a number of non-Gold sponsors; many of these sponsors are non-commercial parties. This led to additional income of €120,000.

CS raised a privacy issue in the context of the conference sponsors, asking whether Gale had an access to participants' personal data in ConfTool. JvE responded that Gale had not sent an email directly but that it had instead been sent by the conference organizer, CAOS, as part of their sponsorship contract. JvE also suggested that Gale likely had its own email lists that it could have used for any other emails.

HS asked about the number of African bursaries offered by LOs. FdJ indicated the LOs were

able to invite 25 people from the African continent, some of which partially covered the trip themselves. They participated in a workshop in Leiden in the week preceding the DH conference.

JvE reported that a PDF version of the Book of Abstracts would be ready soon. For now, the online version is available, with a search engine. They also loaded all of the information into the mobile app that they made available to conference attendees. BC pointed out that according to the revised protocols it is the responsibility of the PC to produce the book of abstracts.

CS pointed out that the conference fee was relatively high in comparison to the previous years. FdJ explained that with growing numbers of participants, one needs a professional organization, in this case CAOS was hired. Additionally, the university buildings could not be used due to refurbishment process that coincided with the conference. KDO thanked the LOs for their presentation and the significant work they had done.

DH2021 Local Organizers

On behalf of the DH2021 local organizers, KN presented their pre-conference report (see the [written version](#)). While the LOs had proposed that conference should take place in August 2021, upon feedback from the SC in Mexico City, they moved the conference to July 2021. This has necessitated moving the conference away from the university and to a conference center. It will also increase the costs of the conference. KN explained that the University of Tokyo would underwrite the increased costs. OE and BC suggested that the projected fee of \$200 might be set at a higher level. KN responded that the trip to Japan will be expensive anyway, which made the LOs think of keeping the fee at a reasonable level.

DH2020 Local Organizers

On behalf of the DH2020 local organizers, Constance Crompton (CC) presented their pre-conference report (see the [written version](#) and [slides](#)). She noted that the LOs are working in close concert with the PC Chairs on the entire endeavor. She presented the theme of the conference, which will focus on First Nations and Indigenous Studies, public digital humanities, and open data. On 15 August, the PC Chairs will publish a call for keynote and plenary panel nominations, as well as a call for new reviewers. Two new presentation formats will be introduced in the CFP: lightning talks and forums (a form of a roundtable with discussion). Another proposed introduction is an open peer review, in contrast to the double-anonymous peer review that was employed for DH2018 and DH2019. A final experiment is the addition of more workshops on Day 7 (Saturday) of the conference. The main program of DH2020 will be scheduled between the two organizing institutions: three days at one campus and three at the other.

The expected total cost of the conference is \$219,000 CAD. Based on the conference protocols, they prepared budgets to break even at 500, 750, and 1000 participants. CC requested that the SC approve the budget, within 10% either way, if the conference is run at cost recovery for 650 participants rather than 500. The conference will be able to host 1000 or more, although larger numbers may necessitate the use of an overflow for plenaries. The LOs plan to use 10% of the budget to allow indigenous scholars to attend the conference without cost. CC said the LOs

would like to know more about the current process for the code of conference complaint, to which BC responded, ADHO has been working already with the code of conduct procedures.

HS and SBC asked whether, firstly, indigenous people from other parts of the world will be eligible for a bursary, and secondly, how the criterion of being an indigenous person will be determined. CC responded that the LOs will simply take people at their word on this question.

11.45 CCC report and discussion (45 minutes)

The CCC report began with a discussion about the proposed PC chairs for DH2021. LM moved to accept Ikki Ohmukai and Taizo Yamada as the PC chairs, PM seconded. 12 for, 0 against, 1 vote of no opinion.

DJ then presented the CCC report (see the [written version](#)). DJ stressed that while its first part is compiled collaboratively by the CCC, she takes full responsibility for the second section.

Firstly, DJ suggested that in the future conference fees for PC chairs, LOs, COB representatives and committee chairs should be waived, as a form of tangible recognition for the service these individuals provide to ADHO. JS, MGo, LM, MK and others eagerly supported this proposal. JS suggested that rather than a blanket policy that individuals could request a fee waiver. PA stressed that ADHO should not be paying the fees for LOs but that they should budget for their own registration. It was decided that CCC would work out the details of the issue. DJ suggested including it in the MOU, to be implemented for DH2021.

Secondly, DJ suggested reconsidering the relation between the PC chairs and the LOs. Specifically, we should consider this a unified group rather than distinct bodies with different tasks. The LOs should not feel divorced from the scholarly content of the conference. Should we decide to make this change, we would need to update the Protocols. DJ suggested getting a small group of PC chairs and LOs to talk about how to make this work, with an aim for making the change for DH2022. OE and ML added that the entire DH conference needs reconsideration, due to its growth in the past few years. ADHO may need to consider changes such as moving the conference to a biannual schedule or the use of a professional conference organizing team.

Finally, the CCC report included recommendations from the Chair for changes to the committee's structure. The COB and EB will consider these recommendations.

12.30 Lunch

13.15 Program Committee 2019 Report (Elena Pierazzo and Fabio Ciotti) (15 minutes)

Program Committee (PC) 2019 Co-Chairs, Elena Pierazzo (EP) and Fabio Ciotti (FC), presented their report. DH2019 had approximately 960 submissions. There were 660 active reviewers, and each proposal was assigned 4 reviews. This year, the PC also added a "late-breaking poster" submission window during April and May, which resulted in an additional 11 posters being accepted. In the end, 379 proposals were accepted, which is a 42% acceptance rate for papers and posters. The PC decided to eliminate full-day workshops this year in order to accommodate

more acceptances. Even with this change, only 34% of workshops were accepted.

For the second year in a row, the PC employed a double-anonymous review process. About 60 of the proposals that were received were not fully anonymized, which created additional work for the PC Chairs. They will be interested to see how the double-open review process works for DH2020, as they suspect that it might require more time on the part of reviewers and could therefore lower participation rates.

The PC Chairs had some suggestions for the SC and future PCs to bear in mind. They found that the size of the Committee was too large to function effectively. They believe that even limiting the number of representatives from the COs to one individual (rather than the two that PC2019 used) would still yield a committee that is too large. They suggested that the work of the PC is long and difficult and that the COs should be more clear about what individuals will need to do as they are making their selections for PC members. Of course, the current size of the conference makes the reviewing burden significant. And since both EP and FC had to each do 40 reviews at the end of the review period, making the PC smaller will impact the amount of work that will likely fall on the shoulders of the PC and the Chairs especially. They also suggested that the DH ConValidator is still not reliable enough for use by the broad community; FC had to work on 50 different abstracts to transform them into proper TEI XML.

13.30 Conference Bids for DH2022 (120 minutes)

- 13.30 Riga, Latvia
- 14.00 Graz, Austria
- 14.30 Lyon, France
- 15.00 Discussion & decision

Following presentations by the different bidding groups, the SC deliberated and voted to hold DH2022 in Graz, Austria.

15.30 COB discussion with SC (60 minutes)

From July 2018 to June 2019, the SC had made decisions that would allow for the ADHO governance transition from the SC to the COB model. For this hour, the COB began its discussions with the whole SC present. The conversation focused on the following topics: the Chair of the new Executive Board (EB); the President of the COB; and Committee Chairs that needed to be appointed following DH2019.

The first topic discussed was the Chair of the EB. Prior to the meetings in Utrecht, the SC had decided that the EB Chair would be nominated by the COs, be elected by the COB, and be appointed to a two-year term. The question of whether or not the Chair's term would be

renewable had yet to be decided and depended on further decisions by the COB. The ADHO Officers had received two nominations: Leif Isaksen and Glen Worthey. The two candidates had each agreed to join the SC on Tuesday, 9 July for brief conversations. The group therefore discussed what questions should be asked of each candidate and settled on the following three:

- Do you currently have time for the position of EB Chair?
- If you were asked to take on this role, would your current employer support you (financially or otherwise) or recognize your service in such a way that it could be valued in your professional life?
- How would you think about building bridges among the different COs and other organizations that make up ADHO?

Additionally, the candidates would be asked whether they had any questions for the SC. As had been decided previously, the EB Chair would be elected to a two-year term.

The second topic was the President of the COB. The Officers explained the role of the President and why the individual should be appointed from the body of the COB rather than in addition to the COB members. The COB will appoint its own President, and determine her or his term of service. While the COB and the EB will have different roles, the President and the Chair will need to work closely with one another.

The third topic was the question of the Chairs of the Infrastructure and Awards Committees. CS discussed the Infrastructure committee and its duties in conjunction with the fact that he will step down from the role following DH2019. The SC discussed the one nomination for the position and how the committee might be restructured to be more effective. One suggestion was for the new committee to include a Committee Chair, the Systems Admin (John Cheng), and a representative from the COB. MK provided a brief report about her time as Awards Committee Chair and the challenges that she faced in the position.

16.30 COB discussion (60 minutes)

For the final hour of Sunday's meeting, the incoming COB met with the ADHO Officers (KDO, ME, BC, and SS). This time was planned so the COB could have a chance to meet by itself prior to assuming its new role within ADHO. The COB will be made up of one representative from each of the 10 ADHO COs. The discussion centered around the question of the President of the COB and who among the COB members would be able to serve in this capacity.

17.30 Adjourn

Tuesday, 9 July, 9.00 - 13.00

Location: Social Impact Factory, Seoul 6, Vredenburg 40, 3511 BD Utrecht

Attendance: officers, committee chairs, CO representatives

Substitutions from Sunday's roster

- Fabio Ciotti (FC) took the place of Barbara Bordalejo as a voting member of EADH
- Chao-Lin Liu (CLL) took the place of Su-Bing Chang as the voting member of TADH

9.00 Coffee and tea

9.30 DSH Reports and proposals (15 minutes)

Following introductions, KDO began the meeting. Edward Vanhoutte (EV) and Victoria Smith (VS) presented the OUP's report on the *DSH* journal. Starting with subscriptions, in 2018 the renewal rate was 99%, while in 2019 it is 98%. All of the 2018 and 2019 issues have appeared on schedule. In 2018 we got 215 submissions, which is a significant increase. The acceptance ratio is highly dependent upon how you choose to calculate it. For example, in 2018, there is a 40.46% acceptance ratio when looking at the number of papers received and papers accepted. If you look instead at the number of papers that reach the final decision stage, the acceptance rate is closer to 52%. In 2018, the highest number of accepted submissions came from the US (28), the UK (27), and then Iran (24), which is a new player in this space.

The average number of days from receipt of a paper to a final decision is 113 days, and the editors ambitiously aim for a 6-week production target. The 2019 volume is full already. Nevertheless, a paper submitted today would get a final decision within 114 days, and within 5-8 weeks OUP will publish it in an advanced access form, with a DOI. It just will not appear in the print edition for several issues to come.

The impact factor varies regularly insofar as *DSH* is a smaller journal (compared to the sciences). The OA movement has been beneficial to the journal. OUP has decided not to count the pages that are being published in OA towards the page budget, since the authors are already paying for them to be published.

VS presented budgetary figures. The journal was a little over (12 pages) in 2018, and they are also tracking above in 2019. There are about 5 issues worth of articles waiting to go into an issue. Some of these papers are probably destined for supplements that will appear later this year. Oxford migrated the journal migrated to a new platform a few years ago, and now one can see the benefits of this decision. Currently, OUP is moving away from traditional marketing (e.g., mugs at conference) and toward digital marketing, where it is easier to make calls to action.

Isabel Galina stepped down as Associate Editor (focusing on the reviews section) at the end of 2018. Paul Gooding has now taken on this role. EV expressed his thanks for Isabel's service.

9.45 Committee Reports (60 minutes)

The **Admissions Committee** began its report (see the [written version](#)) by welcoming RedHD as a full CO. Conversations continue with the Korean and Indian DH associations and each is getting closer to submitting a proposal to become a full CO. Informal conversations continue with other potential COs throughout the world, including GO::DH, which is exploring whether it can transition from its status as a SIG to a CO. HS also observed that the Pedagogy and Training SIG, which was approved in Mexico City, had been very active, already holding its first conference during DHSI's middle weekend in June 2019.

MK began the **Awards Committee** Report (see the [written version](#)) by highlighting the difficulties of working efficiently with a large and diverse committee. She also noted that with the current structure, a nomination of a committee member by a CO does *not* mean that each region of the world is well represented. The SC discussed how COs and Committee Chairs can best interact in situations where CO representatives are not carrying out their responsibilities as committee members. OE, who served as Awards Committee Chair for five years, indicated that it would be helpful if a more formalized process existed in these situations. The Fortier Prize was also discussed, especially the need to make the requirements for eligibility more clear to individuals as they submit proposals within ConfTool. DJ indicated that the CCC could help with this effort and would connect with the PC Chairs for 2020. Referring to KDO's Chair's Report in which she proposed that the Awards Committee could be reimaged as one of the COB's duties, OE pointed to the difficulty of the COB's political role and the need for the Awards Committee to be representative. MK responded by asking what happens if all Fortier Prize nominees are from one region of the world, which can happen if the Committee simply chooses the ten highest-ranked papers following peer review. It then becomes a question whether the Awards Committee needs to consider politics to avoid the appearance of regional bias.

CS began the **Infrastructure Committee (ISC)** report (see the [written version](#)) by expressing his regrets for the two server crashes that happened during the last year, which was difficult for both ADHO and the different organizations and communities that we support via web services. The report is intended to look backward at what happened as well as looking forward, with the goal of strengthening the infrastructure and strengthening user's faith in the same. CS expressed gratitude for the service that Ian Rifkin provided over seven years as ADHO's systems admin and also expressed appreciation for the work that John Cheng, the new systems admin, has done in stepping into a difficult situation. The plan for the coming year is to move away from everything being on one server, which will allow us to maintain communication and other core services should another server crash happen. In short, we need to modernize how we think about our infrastructure, including a mirrored server and the use of virtual machines. We may also need to think about changing our hosting service; the current one has a German-only backend and the contact person at the host prefers to only speak German. This has meant that CS has needed to translate for systems admins. It is critical to find a solution that allows users to interact in English. Most of the ADHO infrastructure is relatively lightweight, although the two Companion websites and *DHQ* run on specialized software. CS indicated that while there is no public documentation, the ISC has a MediaWiki that is very detailed. The discussion turned briefly to

the TEI community, which, following the server crashes, has considered leaving the ADHO servers. They had originally joined ADHO's infrastructure with the thought that being united would make us all stronger, and the SC felt that it was important that the partnership continue if possible. Finally, CS pointed out that ADHO infrastructure runs a number of important services for the broader community, like OxGarage and Roma, but that ADHO's involvement is not always transparent to users.

The **Multilingualism/Multiculturalism Committee** (see the [written version](#) of the report) had planned to work on a new website, which the SC had hoped would be launched with the governance change. This website would describe the ADHO structure in the five official languages, rather than just in English as currently is the case. But, as KDO pointed out, this work was delayed following the changes to the Communication Committee, which took place in January/February 2019. Website updates will almost certainly need to be completed before it can truly support multiple languages.

ASG began her **Publications Committee** report (see the [written version](#)) by pointing out that at present no ADHO journals regularly include Spanish-language content. EP indicated that the RedHD journal has considered coming within ADHO auspices, and while they currently prefer to remain independent, that may not always remain so. To give a broader context, CLL presented the example of the TADH's journal, which accepts submissions in both Chinese and English, while KN mentioned the JADH's practice of having two journals: one in English, one in Japanese. OE presented EADH's landscape, which endorses an Italian journal, a German-language journal, a Nordic-language journal, and a Czech-language journal. EADH is working on establishing a federation of these different journals. JS suggested that the Committee compiles a consolidated list of all the journals endorsed by COs, since from the South African perspective, only *DSH* is accredited at the moment. If such a list existed, it would be easier to complete the process of having these other journals properly accredited.

In response to a question from FC about ADHO's financial support for these other journals, ASG made a recommendation to include a broad publications line-item in the ADHO budget. Without such financial planning, requests to support these publications are difficult to fund. Finally, ASG commented on the composition of the current Publications Committee, which is neither fair nor representative. She proposed that the COB considers whether such a committee is necessary at all, or if its chair could instead be a liaison.

ZB reported on the **SIGs** (see the [written version](#)) by noting that each of the seven SIGs had submitted a summary of its activities. She indicated that one difficulty for the SIGs at present is knowing where they fit into the annual conference program. She appreciated the fact that the CCC Report addressed some of these issues. The SIGs also face difficulties every year as new SIG leadership has to learn the various timelines and procedures for participating within ADHO. The SIGs will have a meeting in Utrecht to draft a protocol to help SIG conveners understand what they need to do and when they need to do it. Finally, ZB raised a question about the process by which SIGs are approved and whether it needs to go through the Admissions Committee. ADHO protocols do not require SIGs to go through Admissions, but HS indicated that Admissions had become involved a few years previously. The COB will therefore need to decide whether it wants proposed SIGs to pass through some sort of review (in the service of making its

deliberations easier).

10.45 Brief break (15 minutes)

11.00 EB Chair Interviews

The two candidates—Leif Isaksen and Glen Worthey—for the position of EB Chair each met individually with the SC. The SC asked them the questions that they had planned during the Sunday meeting and provided time for each candidate to ask questions of the SC. Each of these meetings lasted approximately 15 minutes.

The SC then reviewed the budget for FY2020, which SS had adjusted since Sunday in response to that day's discussions. LM moved to approve the budget for FY2020. JS and KF seconded the motion, and the revised budget was adopted by a vote of 13-0.

12.00 Governance Transition (15 minutes)

The SC determined that it had then concluded its business and proceeded to a vote to dissolve itself and to incorporate the COB as the governing body of ADHO. OE moved to do so, and FC seconded. It was approved by a vote of 13-0.

As planned, the COB then voted to approve the various decisions the SC had already taken. These decisions were the following:

- Approving the budget for FY2019
- Approving the revised budget for FY2020
- Approving the PC Chairs for DH2021
- Approving the selection of Graz, Austria as the venue for DH2022

LM moved to approve these decisions, and EB seconded the motion. It was approved by a vote of 10-0.

With its business concluded, the SC again thanked KDO and the other ADHO Officers for their work and those individuals who were not on the COB left.

12.15 COB Meeting (60 minutes)

The COB began its first official meeting by inviting DJ to have a brief discussion about three-year rotation of the conference. DJ acknowledged that the unsuccessful bidders had asked for feedback about their bids and that asking them to wait for another three years to elapse before submitting again seemed problematic. At the same time, we have established a pattern where

successful bidders tend to be groups who have previously failed to get the bid. Is that actually the pattern that we want to establish?

Since the SC had already expressed a sentiment in its 2018 meeting that the three-year rotation for the conference may not be a project we want to continue, a proposal was made to have DH2023 use an open call for conference proposals, rather than requiring that it take place in North America, as would traditionally be the case. As part of an open process, it was suggested that the bidding process begin with a letter of intent, which would be submitted in the Fall. SB moved to have an experimental, open call for DH2023 hosts, which would include a two-stage process with letters of intent. MGo seconded. It was approved by a vote of 9-1. EP expressed dissent over concerns that countries in the global south like Mexico might be less likely to secure a conference in a region-free bidding process. DJ indicated that the CCC would work with the COB to decide what the letter of intent should contain and when it should be received.

A discussion was also raised about the possibility of moving the conference to a biannual schedule, with regional CO-hosted conference happening in the off years.

The COB moved on to the various appointments it needed to make. SB moved to appoint SS as Treasurer for another year. EB seconded. The motion was approved by a vote of 10-0. Then, SB moved to appoint BC as EB Secretary for another year. LM seconded. The motion was approved by a vote of 10-0. The COB then voted on the EB Chair. The voting was in favor of appointing Leif Isaksen to the position for a two-year term. The COB then returned to its consideration of the President of the COB. After discussion and voting, MGo was appointed to a one-year term as President of the COB and EB was appointed to a one-year term as President-elect.

For its final action of the meeting, the COB voted to approve the new Board of Stichting ADHO, with Leif Isaksen as President, BC as Secretary, and SS as Treasurer. The motion was approved by a vote of 10-0.

13.30 Adjourn