

Polanyi Society Board Meeting Minutes

Annual Board Meeting – Virtual Format

October 17, 2020

Members present: Collin Barnes, Ellen Bernal, Jean Bocharova, Jon Fennell, Tihamér Margitay, Esther Meek, Phil Mullins (presiding), Andy Steiger, David Stewart (ex officio), Bruce Vojak, Craig Wickstrom

Guests: Gus Breystack (proxy for Collin Barnes during his absence for a portion of the meeting), Andrew Grosso, Walter Gulick, Paul Lewis, Charles Lowney, Richard Moodey

1. Welcome

The meeting was called to order by Phil at 11:00 am Central Daylight Savings time.

2. Approval of Polanyi Society Board Meeting Minutes for San Diego, California Hilton Bayfront Sapphire 400B meeting of November 22, 2019

The minutes were accepted without discussion or change.

3. 2020 Treasurer's Report

Charles provided a brief summary of the written report he submitted, indicating that Polanyi Society (hereafter PS) finances are doing well, staying in the black, with increased operating revenue.

Charles submitted his report for discussion by the Board.

– Craig raised questions, including:

- The timing of the fiscal year. Charles indicated that it currently runs from September 1 through August 31.
- Whether and how royalties are collected for *Tradition and Discovery* (hereafter TAD) articles. Charles indicated that they are collected and paid by EBSCO for downloads.
- Whether speaker honorariums were paid from the special projects and travel budget. Charles indicated that typically they are not used in this way. These funds are intended more for use by students to cover travel.
- Whether the society must spend part of the endowment each year. Phil indicated that there is an expectation to spend 3% of the equivalent of the endowment annually.
- How easy it would be to transfer funds out of the Vanguard account. Charles indicated that it would be easy to convert and withdraw funds and not take long to do so.
- About balance fluctuations over the past few years. Charles indicated that they ranged from ~\$130K to ~\$150k, and Walter compared this variation (~17%) to what the market had done over this same time period. Group discussion ensued.

- Gus noted that the report included figures dated August 31, 2018. Charles corrected this during the meeting.

4. 2020 Nominating Committee Report

Jon submitted his report for discussion by the Board.

- Tihamér was thanked for his service to the Board.

Motion: Elect Charles Lowney to the first year of a first term commencing in 2021. Elect Collin Barnes to a first year of a second term commencing in 2021. Elect Jon Fennell to the first year of a third term commencing in 2021. Elect Ellen Bernal to a first year of a second term commencing in 2021. Elect Charles Lowney Treasurer.

- Jon submitted the Motion. Ellen seconded the Motion.
- Jon was thanked for his service as Treasurer for two years, and Charles Lowney was thanked for his service as “unofficial assistant Treasurer” (a role required for financial signature authority). They are now switching roles.
- **The Motion was carried.**

5. 2020 Membership Report

Jon submitted his report for discussion by the Board.

- Jean asked for a definition of the “inactive list.” Jon indicated that this list includes those who are three years or more past their last dues payment. This list is maintained to not lose the identity of those who have been members in the past. Craig asked about whether information was kept about why individuals have become inactive. Jon documents everything he knows about their inactivity.
- Jon mentioned an addition to his report, that three individuals had contacted Jon in the past month about joining the PS. Discussion ensued about who these people are and why they are interested.
- Jon raised the question of whether TAD is what attracts membership.
- David indicated a desire to not have to cross paywalls to access TAD. He also raised the idea of revisioning what membership dues are for, given that TAD is proposed to no longer be in print form.

Phil thanked Jon for his continuing pursuit of membership.

Phil closed the discussion by stating his belief that we, as a society, need to keep after membership and encourage donations.

6. 2020 TAD Report

Paul thanked David for assuming the General Editor role and Jean for assuming the Book Review Editor role.

Paul noted that costs were lower this year since only one issue appeared in print.

Paul submitted his report for discussion by the Board.

- Phil noted his intent to thank Mercer for covering the cost of mailing the print issue.
- Walter asked whether the larger size format when printed would result in different pagination. Paul believes that pagination on the PDF versions would be the same, while ebook readers do not. Paul indicated that TAD might go to an 8.5x11 format to facilitate self-printing. David indicated that the PDF version would be the official version so that its pagination would hold.
- Craig asked about a print on demand option. David indicated that, while possible, it would reintroduce set up fees from Faithlab, the elimination of which represents ~30% of the cost savings. Bruce asked about producing an annual volume and how set up fees might be impacted by this. Paul indicated that this could be explored. David indicated that perhaps a once-a-year print volume is possible, perhaps through a vendor other than Faithlab.

David discussed three proposed changes for TAD:

- (1) All-digital TAD as the only format (already pursuing this during the time of COVID)
- (2) TAD having its own website
- (3) Publishing TAD “as-we-go” (perhaps a more long-term idea)

David submitted these proposed changes for discussion by the Board.

- Bruce asked about clarifying the relationship between the PS and TAD, such as whether there are separate bylaws, separate structures, etc. Paul responded by noting that he formed a TAD editorial board, but that it is not independent but part of the PS. David noted that TAD and the PS are different, with different agendas and goals. Bruce returned to his original question about the relationship between the two, noting that no documentation of the current understanding of the relationship seems to exist. Walter noted that TAD is explicitly described as “a journal of the Polanyi Society.” Phil indicated that the relationship has evolved over time and that some clarification may make sense. Jean noted that TAD is not separate in the business sense, but perhaps separate in the user sense. She indicated that adding language such as “TAD is associated (or affiliated) with the Polanyi Society” might be appropriate. Paul found additional language that is on the TAD website, but not on the TAD masthead.ⁱ
- Paul segued to note that TAD having its own website grew out of it being an open-access journal (with a separate website common for open access), requiring very little financial investment. David also mentioned that other journals that are published by a society have their own websites, not requiring access through the society website.
- David returned to his question about what dues for the PS are for.
- Walter encouraged that TAD transition to a publish-as-we-go model, and asked about how we might proceed. David indicated that TAD has a lot of freedom on that, such as a special issue surrounding a symposium. It’s mostly a matter of letting Faithlab know, with TAD deciding. David indicated that under this model we would work within an annual number of pages

available for publishing, with a volume for each year, rather than an annual number of issues. David noted the greater flexibility of this new model, that we could do it however we like. Paul and David indicated that, in the near term, TAD would continue with the three-issues-per-year model. Charles suggested that TAD move to a sequential page numbering system over the entire calendar year going forward, resetting page numbering when going to the next volume, rather than to the next issue.

Motion: That the Polanyi Society Board approves the TAD Board recommendation that TAD continue the relationship with Faithlab for another year.

- Collin submitted the Motion. Jean seconded the Motion.
- **The Motion was carried.**

7. 2020 Travel Committee Report

Esther submitted her report for discussion by the Board.

No discussion ensued, primarily because both the Nashotah and Annual in-person meetings were replaced by virtual meetings.

8. 2020 Program Committee Report

Walter submitted his report for discussion by the Board.

- Extensive discussion took place regarding the relationship with the AAR and/or perhaps other groups, such as the American Philosophical Society. Walter raised the question of whether the PS should continue its relationship with the AAR. AAR did refund the funds already this year for sessions that have been canceled. He noted that ending the relationship would reduce costs, but also reduce access to AAR participants and sessions. Phil mentioned that, along these lines, the PS is up for its reexamination to be a “related scholarly organization (RSO).” There were questions raised about whether the PS continued to qualify for this designation as the AAR focusses on its core mission and audience. It became clear during the discussion that few PS members are currently AAR members. David asked whether it might be more appropriate to explore a relationship with the American Philosophical Society. The question raised about all of these relationships was whether a sufficient number of walk-ins might be captured by such alignment of in-person meetings. Charles asked about whether we might have access to AAR mailing lists. Phil indicated that we do not have such access. Gus spoke of working, perhaps with the Torrance Society (a matter Andrew has already been working on). Bruce asked about whether there are other ways to increase participation in meetings, if that is the primary goal of working with AAR, other than aligning with it. Jon advocated for in-person Nashotah-type meetings vs. Zoom vs. AAR-related meetings, citing that such in-person meetings are more beneficial to participants, with much richer interactions, as well as being less expensive. The benefit of moving meetings to different locations (such as the recent Cambridge meeting) over time was noted by Andy. Charles echoed this, pointing out the value of holding related meetings (perhaps a day or portion of a day) at nearby colleges or universities. He also noted that we’ve not been very proactive in seeking walk-ins from AAR participants. He also spoke about the benefit of the AAR relationship in making the Charles Taylor event happen. As a result of all this

discussion, Walter will start working on the RSO application for AAR, just to keep that option open.

- Andrew identified date possibilities for Nashotah in the May/June time frame: May 24 to May 28; May 31 to June 4; and June 28 to July 2. Phil noted that an early June window has worked the best in terms of participation, as well as that the most recently-planned session ran into trouble with COVID. General discussion emerged about whether COVID would prohibit the running of such a meeting in this time frame for 2021. Andrew will contact the people at Nashotah House to let them know that we remain interested in possibly holding an in-person meeting there this year, without committing to do so at this time, perhaps not even committing until early May.

9. 2020 Web Site Committee Report

Skipped without discussion.

10. 2020 Endowment Committee Report

Covered earlier as part of the 2020 Treasurer's Report.

11. New Business: 2021 Nashotah House Conference

See discussion related to this topic under the heading "2020 Program Committee Report" above.

12. New Business: 2021 Annual Meeting at San Antonio AAR meeting in November 2021

See discussion related to this topic under the heading "2020 Program Committee Report" above.

13. New Business: Zoom Meetings

See discussion related to this topic under the heading "2020 Program Committee Report" above.

14. New Business: Compensation for TAD Editor and Book Review Editor

Motion: The Board authorizes \$5000 to be spent in 2021 as stipends for the TAD Editor and Book Review Editor. The specific amount of compensation for each party will be worked out in conversation involving the TAD Editor, Book Review Editor and the PS Executive Committee in terms of payments made in conjunction with each TAD issue.

- Collin submitted the Motion. Craig seconded the Motion.
- Discussion ensued:
 - Craig asked about the long-term financial implications of this Motion, as a precedent would be established, even with this one-year commitment.
 - After some quiet, Jon expressed that there may be a reluctance to speak because those impacted are part of this discussion.
 - Jon asked if this amount was sufficient for what we are asking of the TAD Editor and Book Review Editor. Phil believes "no" but that it is a reasonable amount for the PS to fund. David agreed but also noted the precedent of these not being funded positions.

- Paul provided some background, such as this compensation used to enable the TAD Editor and Book Review Editor to attend annual meetings. Charles noted that the cost savings of going digital could help fund this.
 - Charles noted that, for those in full-time university positions, the TAD Editor and Book Review Editor are considered part of their service obligation. Yet, for those not in such positions, including those in adjunct roles, they have no such obligation and, thus, no funding available.
 - Gus asked about separating out the travel component of these funds. Charles thought that the proposed \$5,000 would be used for travel, as well as for general compensation.
 - David noted that the amount of work for the TAD Editor and Book Review Editor roles, these are big jobs, not necessarily resulting in professional advancement. He also reminded the Board that, when he took on the role of TAD Editor, it was with the understanding that his travel would be covered.
 - Paul suggested that the Motion may be modified so that tenure-track faculty might not be eligible for the full funding.
 - Jon, instead, felt that compensation would be provided for expectations of the job, like attending meetings.
 - David clarified that the employment status should be considered for compensation and that travel funding should be provided for any TAD Editor or Book Review Editor.
 - Walter raised his concern that adjuncts are exploited by the higher-education “industry.” Tihamér concurred that the situation is highly unethical. Ellen asked whether David and Jean were part-time workers with no securing. David confirmed this. Ellen supported providing a stipend.
 - Esther mentioned the availability of the funds provided by Wally Meade. Craig agreed that this is an option.
 - Bruce asked about whether travel and compensation might be separated, with separate budgets. Bruce also asked about funding for required travel for other Board Members, such as those expected to attend the Annual Board Meeting.
 - David clarified that travel reimbursement (a provision already negotiated for his TAD Editor role) would be separate from the compensation discussed here.
 - Jon clarified that the compensation discussed here is separate and voiced his support for it.
 - Paul noted the amount of work required for the TAD Editor and Book Review Editor was such that he fully supports this compensation.
 - Tihamér voiced support for this compensation.
- Craig called the question for a vote. Jon seconded it. Jean abstained, noting a conflict of interest.
- **The Motion was carried.**

The meeting was called to a close by Phil at 1:43 pm Central Daylight Savings time.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce A. Vojak

January 3, 2021

ⁱ *Tradition and Discovery* (hereafter *TAD*) is an academic journal that is independently published and owned by the Polanyi Society, an IRS 501C3 designated (non-profit) US corporation registered in Missouri. *TAD* is managed by the *TAD* Editor (and Editorial Board) whose work is annually reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Polanyi Society, Inc. *TAD* is prepared for publication by Faithlab in Macon, Georgia." (<http://polanyisociety.org/Aims-and-Scope-9-12-18.htm>)