

EADH Minutes

Mid-term meeting of the EADH Executive Committee

Monday, 27 November 2017, 9:00 – 17:00

Sala Club, Colegiul Academic

str. Em. de Martonne nr. 1

Cluj

(coffee breaks: 11:00-11:30 and 16:00-16:30; lunch 13:00-14:30)

Agenda

Please note: all documents uploaded in AGORA will be **taken as read**

## **1. Attendance and agenda**

Meeting began at 9:00am EET

Present:

Elena Spadini (ES)

Elisabeth Burr (EB)

Maurizio Lana (ML)

Edward Vanhoutte (EV)

Fabio Ciotti (FC)

Claire Clivaz (CC)

Leif Isaksen (LI)

Øyvind Eide (ØE)

Corinna Moldovan (CM)

Ondřej Tichý (OT)

Apologies received from Inna Kizhner (IK), Barbara Bordalejo (BB), Aurélien Berra (AB) and Charlotte Tupman (CT)

ØE expresses thanks to CM for hosting the meeting

CM very happy that we have been able to come to Cluj.

CM also announces that first edition of Romanian DH journal has been produced.

Thanks to CC for contribution. Invites contributions from other members of Committee

No items added to Agenda - Agenda is accepted.

DHR have sent application to join EADH. Will be addressed under 8g.

New members of the Committee (ES & OT) are welcomed to the committee.

## **2. Minutes of the Montréal 2017 exec meeting and matters arising**

Minutes are accepted as correct (motion FC, seconded ML).

### **3. Elections 2018**

#### **1. Formation of the nominating committee 2018**

ØE notes the elections were successful with some quirks. The benefit of using OUP is that they provide a system. To replace it requires creating a new system.

EADH requires a new Nominations committee.

ML (Chair), LI, ES & CC are appointed to Committee. Proposed FC, seconded EV. All in favour.

**ACTION POINT:** Nominations Committee to create guidelines based on previous experience with support from CC.

ØE: Need to calculate date for election back from conference date (Mexico) asap.

#### **Co-option of new member of the executive**

OT: The Czech association has been established in its first general meeting at the Faculty of Arts at Charles University. The website has been set up, thanks expressed for setting up infrastructure. Now considering how best to accept new members.

Apologies expressed from ØE and OT regarding issues re translation for Czech constitution. Need to pay attention in future that translations provided.

OT has been co-opted as a representative of CzADH.

ØE notes that co-option can be done at any time. We have discussed the reasons in previous meetings. Agreed in previous meetings that it should be done for specific reasons.

ØE invites any specific proposals.

EB: I think we should consider countries which are not represented any more. Spain and Portugal for instance. But no specific proposal.

ØE: prefer not to spend time on general discussions

ES: I'm here in part because of specific requests in election call. Seen some discussion of co-opting James O' Sullivan or other ECRs. Not to make a concrete proposal, but once I understand better how the committee works, I might wish to propose to co-opt James or others.

ØE: worth noting that two of the most influential individuals only have bachelor's degrees and I started as PhD student. Long tradition of including ECRs and students

ML: There are significant costs involved. We should consider offering financial support to ECRs.

ØE: also noting that financial support

FC: should we ask president to ask HDH to recommend someone for co-option? That could be a good idea given that they are already an established association

EB: Do we have a membership list?

FC: Yes, I can send it.

LI: If we go down that path, then we'll be obliged to take the person on. That's OK, but then we need to decide it's what we want to do.

FC: it's more complicated

ØE: I'd prefer not to open up to general discussions without a specific proposal.

EV: We are approaching this from an emotional perspective. There are a wide number of other countries or individuals we could co-opt. Do we have document about the process?

ØE: Yes, produced by LI and AB last year.

Discussion concludes with no specific recommendations, but members may propose candidates for co-option at summer meeting

-----

ØE: Confirms that FC wishes to stand down as membership secretary

FC: Yes. For the next couple of years things will be complicated but will get better in the long run. Historically associated with ADHO membership secretary but this is now an ADHO committee. Would like to recommend ES for the role if she is willing.

ES: I'm fine with it unless anyone else wishes to do it.

EB: confirms that there will be a transition phase.

LI: the role requires some wrangling of AOs to ensure our membership processes are harmonised for the purpose of elections

FC: We will also need to require OUP to send a different spreadsheet. We are only 4 AOs for now.

ØE: It will be solvable. Keep in touch with and other officers. We have a process for dealing with any problems arising.

FC: A formal letter from President to AOs would help.

ØE: If there are no other candidates we should move to vote

ML: As we saw from elections, we need clear data from a specific date.

ØE: This is also in feedback and should be in the guidelines.

ØE: No other proposals.

**Motion:** ES appointed as Membership secretary: FC proposes, EV seconds. All in favour.

-----

ØE: Need to confirm that AB is being appointed to ADHO Pubs Committee

EV: Can LI describe the purpose of the committee

ØE: It will disappear in 6 months due to ADHO governance changes

LI describes role of ADHO Pubs Committee. Notes that it comprises editors of ADHO publications, but that their focus is largely on the delivery of those publications and committee struggles to develop collective vision. A Publications Officer has been proposed as part of the new governance strategy.

EV: Early on there was more activity. Published jointly between DSH and DHQ for instance. Didn't really work out so well in the longer term.

EV: Could we have an assembly of editors annually to discuss issues of how to manage editing in the current (and changing) climate? We can learn from each other.

LI: That's probably a recommendation best addressed to the ADHO Pubs Committee rather than EADH.

-----

Elena G-B is no longer a member of the EADH Exec and on the ADHO Awards Committee. This is a role which requires formal representation from EADH. Elena has not signalled a wish to step down. It is a fairly substantial role with some political ramifications and so should be considered by the Exec.

EB: Does Elena know she is still on the committee?

ØE: I will check.

ØE reminds Exec that it has the right to appoint someone

EV: It would be good to empower someone from outside the Exec. It's a weakness that the work all comes down to the EADH Exec. A good way to improve the vitality is to allow non-exec members to fulfil roles as long as they report back.

ØE: I agree, and it's not a problematic issue in itself. And it's a separate issue from co-option.

EV confirms that being a member is not a requirement.

ØE: Agreed action is to confirm with E G-B whether she wants to be replaced. We won't request her removal if she prefers to stay on.

LI: Exec needs to confirm that she is still a member in good standing (there was some question as to this during last year's elections and HDH is not an AO).

EB: We can also invite the EADH appointed Awards Committee member to present at Exec meetings where available.

#### **4. Treasurer's report**

ØE: There is no Treasurer's report

[CT joins meeting via skype]

CT (via Skype). Sorry I can't be there. The transition hasn't yet happened but scheduled for Wednesday. I haven't yet received facts and figures to compile a report. I will do that as soon as I am available for discussion on mailing list. Is that acceptable to Exec?

ØE: Yes. We still have the docs from summer and will use those. When we come to points where money is relevant we have enough experienced members to manage. If there are specific Qs we can contact via email or skype

CT: Update: £8,385 of income to EADH from ADHO

ØE: There are three income streams:

- Institutional streams libraries, etc. which runs ADHO
- Money from OUP from membership fees. That money goes to EADH from ADHO
- Money from AOs who transfer their money directly to EADH. That money is never seen by OUP.

CT: that's my understanding from Paul.

ØE: We can discuss the spreadsheets. Is there anything you want to ask?

CT: Do you have any particular Qs or concerns to discuss with Paul during handover?

EB: Can we confirm whether DHD has transferred fees from 2016? Paul says no. German Treasurer says yes. We need to resolve situation. Similarly for DHN.

FB: Can you define a fixed date before which AOs should give their money to EADH? This is important for many other issues such as membership and elections. E.g. if end of financial year is December, then a date in February would be ideal.

ØE: In this context it is important to remember that we need to limit the number of transactions because of different currencies and the costs incurred.

LI: Need to confirm whether Exec are happy for LI and CT to have individual discussions related to EADH finance given potential for conflict of interest

ØE: Proposes that this acceptable as long as transparent. LI and CT should notify Exec if they have significant discussions on this topic.

EV: Can you do a quick check of the accounts of the Association? I'm a Trustee and haven't signed them off. Charities typically require them to be signed off.

ØE: Also need to confirm any changes regarding Charity Law requirements.

ØE: Thanks again for your willingness to serve. We will discuss finances over email and Agora hopefully shortly after Wednesday.

[CT signs off]

-----

ØE: Total income is in the region of approx. £10K. Many of our expenses are covered through ADHO. When we look at the expenses it is worth remembering that it is just part of the picture.

There has been a long term worry that income is from one source (OUP) -  $\frac{3}{4}$  -  $\frac{2}{3}$  was libraries. In new system, OUP money goes to ADHO, and membership funds EADH. That means that if libraries pulled out then ADHO would stop functioning but not EADH. Important to remember that the money we are spending from members and institutions are financing ADHO. Relevant when thinking about our responsibilities to be working for members. There is a perception that we are being paid to do things by individuals and AOs so we need to take on board their requests seriously. The good news is that membership is stable. There is also no particular fear that institutional subscriptions will fall.

EV: the issue of responsibility is important. Important to fine-tune subscription processes. Still not clear whether subscribing to journal makes you a member, or vice versa. Important in terms of what people think they are getting for free, and because of growing demand of Open Access. This is a discussion that has been overlooked for many years. As these topics grow in intensity, the answer to the question above is increasingly important.

ØE: I recommend that we break for coffee and discuss this.

EV: I could also produce a report that discusses the ramifications of either approach.

EB: need to keep in mind that there is also membership without subscription.

ES: There is not a lot of information about it. I didn't realise that most of the money coming here comes from the journal. When I pay for the journal I assume it goes to OUP.

1. *Projections 2018*
2. *Expenditures 2017-18*
3. *ADHO Finances*

## 5. Membership report

FC: No news since summer because received no info from OUP. Numbers are the same. FC to produce new report nonetheless. Reminder of main trends: small decrease in members. Direct membership in EADH fell by 15%. AIUCD also fell slightly. Bear in mind that previous year's conference was in Europe so may be just a datapoint. You can generally see a relationship of increase when it is.

**Action Point:** ES to produce updated membership report

EB: Can we get a breakdown of different kinds of demographics and who is paying for the journal?

FC: There was an issue with DHN who lost a lot of members after first year. Taking only EADH membership (140) only 32 are paying for the journal.

EB: Can you say what country they are from?

FC: No, but can go by currency. Most are Euros. Some (10) are GBP so presumably UK. 20% of membership is paying for the journal and decreasing year on year.

ØE: When the price for the online only subscription was given, it was asked why it was similar expense. Answer was that the pricing is not to undermine the cost of paper publication while reflecting the slightly cheaper costs.

ØE: One thing we may want to discuss in future is to say that if you want to join and have the journal we encourage online subscription.

ØE: Also issues related to membership. Do we need to contact OUP about this?

ML: Voting rights are restricted to those who are on formal voting lists.

FC: I don't like the idea of joint membership because it raises various problems. Re the issue of membership for elections is duplication across membership lists. It's not a huge problem but it's not ideal.

FC: Joint members should be able to vote in all relevant COs and therefore EADH.

EV: There's problem with the OUP website - lots of historical changes have been lost in in the change of platform.

FC: I can confirm this. At this moment no-one can become a joint member.

EV: We also need to make it much easier and clearer how to join. It's currently very confusing.

FC: In previous version we found a way to have a direct link to a EADH membership page without going through OUP Splash page. The ACH has already done this.

ØE: We should replace the link on the EADH membership page to a new page on OUP website.

FC: We can try to set up a form that connects with a service rather than a Webpage.

**ACTION POINT:** ØE & ES: Membership needs to be a top-level category on the web page

EV: It also needs to say what it costs.

ØE: It has been decided that you can either join every society, or you can have a joint membership without voting rights (if you want to support them). But in current situation there are still joint members who need to have voting rights.

LI: How to deal with Honorary members that can't be contacted?

ØE: an issue for the Election Committee but appoint a small team to see if we can establish where they are.

**ACTION POINT:** (ELECTION COMMITTEE) to appoint team to get in touch with:

Prof. Gordon Dixon (UK, honorary)

Mrs Joan M Smith (UK, honorary)

Prof. Roy Wisbey (UK, honorary)

EB: There are intelligent people in Germany who found a way to join DHD and save €20 if they do it through EADH subscription only (€30) instead of DhD (€50) so we need to look into this.

FC: Not possible to become member of AIUCD via EADH which solves problem.

AP: ES, EB & CT should have starting discussion to clarify problem and consequences and report back.

ML: We shouldn't allow people to join a society via another society

EB: This has happened for historical reasons.

## 6. Chair's report

ØE:

- We have a new Treasurer (see discussion)
- We attended the Krasnoyarsk conference. It was a good conference academically and comparable to regional conferences elsewhere. An impressive translation system through simultaneous translation, especially as many of the senior members of the community speak little english and vice versa. We were also invited to attend the first meeting of DHN. Maksim was elected for one year for establishment of organisation - Borodkin requested it be for longer (3 or 5 years - to confirm with Inna).
- ØE was invited to Lagos. First DH conference in Western Africa. Western African conference by organised by Nigeria with some national focus. Huge number of papers with long plenary sessions. Two parallel sessions. Many papers received but not able to come due to lack of expenses. Majority of papers were local. Particular focus on social media & social science. A formal organisation is being created, and most people who wanted to be involved were able to be. See EADH as a possibility for co-operation but no concrete proposals for relationship to EADH.
- Been in touch with Olaf about website and Drupal. Agreed not to write fixed contract because no work foreseen this year but happy to be available for support.
- Antonio's term as Communication Fellow is ending at the end of this year. The Committee expresses its thanks for his excellent work. He is being replaced by Francesca Giovannetti who began earlier this year.

7. **DSH editor's report (EV –[Vision and Challenges in AGORA](#))**

8. **Association Initiatives and strategic planning**

[IK joins via skype]

ØE: Thank you for sending the application for AO through. Rather than decide today we would like to spend some time to be able to read through it and decide via online communication

IK: That's no problem at all.

Brief introductions between IK, OT and ES

IK: Thank you to all who came to the conference - it was hugely appreciated

ØE: All of us who came had a wonderful time and are very grateful for the opportunity.

ØE: Thanks for joining us - we'll communicate in due course via email or Skype

[IK leaves meeting]

**ACTION POINT (ALL):** To agree on whether to accept DHR as AO.

**9. DSH: Future Developments**

ØE: Open conversation on DSH - should have a high level conversation about what we want DSH to be as a journal.

EV: Editorial team consisting of Wendy Anderson, Isobel Garina, Paul Gooding, and EV have produced report available in Agora.

One aim is to set out guidance for those getting involved with the Journal's editorial process. The aim is not to determine it in the long run but to act as a basis for future developments.

Also want to open discussion about purpose of journal.

Change of name has also created an enormous increase in submissions, which in turn affects page budget (currently 912 pages annually). Can only publish as much as subscribers want to pay for.

One change is publishing the conference as a separate issue so that it no longer puts pressure on the page budget. This new reality is also reflected in the reduction in backlog from 2 years to just under 1 year.

At the moment, the next three issues are full. If you submitted today you would likely be published in December 2018.

This raises questions:

- Do we need to publish this many papers?
- Do we need to continue to be the same welcoming platform that it is at present with concomitant community effort in terms of multiple stages of peer review?
- Do we have the luxury of saying we have so many submissions that we can afford to be more restrictive?

2 issues:

- Language - do we accept papers that have significant language problems?
- How do I as an editor interpret the recommendations of peer reviewers? Potentially could be more strict.

Some have expressed opinion that only the highest quality papers should be accepted. Others have said that the peer review leads to higher quality overall.

Need feedback from EADH because it is the owner of the journal.

FC: is there an accept/reject ratio?

EV: No, because it is highly dependent on the period of time and doesn't give an accurate impression.

ML: Is poor quality of language a minor or major revision.

EV: If it's not comprehensible I don't send it to reviewers. If it's comprehensible I'd forward it on (and they always comment).

ML: I suspect that we could be stricter. Major revisions could relate to two different aspects: 1) substantial flaws in conceptual approach, 2) reviewer disagrees with conceptual approach. In the first case, if the language is poor there should be no second chance. In the second, then there should be an opportunity for revision.

EV: depends a lot of the nature of the review, extensive or not, etc. Two years ago, introduced the need to submit the names of 5 potential reviewers (which Editor can choose to use or not). This has helped to extend and broaden the reviewer base. It works well. Can also point out people who you don't want to review it to avoid 'wars' between different schools of thought. Also see from reviews that academics are generally honest in seeing that they disagree with the approach but still willing to say it's good research.

LI: The presentation given by EV in Russia was very informative. Can you share the slides?

EV: Yes - they're on slideshare, will send link. Covers gender balance, single/multi-author papers, themes, etc. One conclusion is that the average length of papers is decreasing, and the number of authors is increasing. In conference papers, gender balance is more or less equal. In other papers it skews heavily to male authors.

**ACTION POINT:** EV to send link to slides from Russian DSH presentation

CM: can you comment on multi-author papers?

EV: Single author papers are generally authored by full professors towards the end of their career. Multi-author papers tend to products of interdisciplinary research projects.

ØE: Distinction between high quality and broad journal. It is not as bad as working for a conference but still difficult to make a hard decision about papers and argue it is based on quality, because comparing very different kinds of disciplinary approaches or ways of assessing quality. If one major revision leads to reject and the other is extremely positive, you can risk relying too much on points, and rejecting good papers out of hand. I see the need to increase selection process. But danger of saying we will improve 'quality' without defining what it is.

EV: I think either path leads to a high quality journal, but the process will affect who will be presented.

ES: How many review cycles are there?

EV: As many as it takes. Up to 4 or 5.

ØE: An alternative is to create support groups for writers, rather than relying on editors and reviewers.

EV: The challenge with crowdsourcing is that confidentiality to explore a topic is lost because it's out in the open.

ØE: Suggestion was to see if people would help in coaching offers.

EV: That seems quite idealistic, given how hard it is to get reviewers. Often get great feedback from reviewers who refuse to look at revisions. That adds to workload of Editor. There is a huge workload for the Editor. Every two year we have conference of OUP journal editors - it's problem that occurs everywhere: no one wants to review but everyone wants to publish. So the whole community-based culture of peer-reviewing is disappearing. Trying to think about ways around this. One approach is to give out certificates to reviewers so that they can demonstrate good use of their time. Other journals are experimenting with giving out vouchers for OUP pubs. Others are experimenting with paying reviewers.

OT: To float an idea: is there a middle ground which could be a two-tier of very high quality papers, and open access that is still good but not highest quality.

EV: The issue is that the view is that either you get published or you don't.

OT: Could it be branded in a different way?

FC: Concern that it could double the work. Effectively asking EV to run two journals

ML: Would reviewers be more willing to review revisions if we offered some assistance?

EV: We do this already. We make clear what revisions have been made through description and track changes. The issues is that it still takes more time, and some reviewers feel that their work is done.

ØE: We need to wind up here to move onto other issues. Any closing remarks? We will continue discussion online.

FC: The reviewer's points are fair that if the points are minor then the Editorial Board should be able to decide whether the corrections are reasonable.

ØE: recommends **ACTION POINT** (all): we each write a response to Edward's proposals for DSH reviewing policy.

EV: Key question for everyone - are you OK for me to be stricter with reviewing?

FC: There are a number of other regional and language based journals which can take content that DSH doesn't publish.

EV: There is no such thing as one level of top quality research - depends on culture, subject, etc. Can't compare the peer review of one paper to that of another.

Thanks for the input. Looking forward to reading comments.

## **10. AO's developments (EB- [Report in AGORA](#))**

ØE: I'd like to propose that the main proposal/request in report in Agora. There was a decision made to give money to a federation service and a disbursement to the AOs. We need to confirm the budget and disburse it.

Separately, we need to decide for 2018, but we can't do this until have agreed on the present budget.

EB: to clarify: the EADH money stays with EADH. The money for the AOs also stays with EADH, but the AO's are informed that their 2017 payment of income can have this

amount deducted. This should be communicated immediately, and then communicate a date by which this information should be submitted to EADH by AOs.

FC: I strongly agree.

**ACTION POINT:** ØE and CT to communicate with AOs about financial transfers between AOs and EADH.

## **11. Report of EASSH (EB- [Report in AGORA](#))**

ØE: My understanding that this still an important place for us to play a role so we should continue.

EB: This was a good meeting with an interesting community including DARIAH and CLARIN. More about science politics, and getting more humanities and social sciences in FP9, but also looking for other topics where this community should be more present.

## **12. Scholarships and grants**

ØE: propose that we leave this until the budget with understanding that we probably have reserves we can use if we choose to.

## **13. EADH conference**

ØE: Need to decide this today. This has been discussed partly online already. Given that this was the first time we can improve next time in terms of explaining what format to use. We have two good proposals and this has been a success.

Let's have a discussion and see what comes up first

EB: I have a small proposal - whoever gets the conference, it would be good to put an advisor with them to help them and support EADH culture.

Discussion held as to relative merits of both submissions.

Vote held: Galway decided upon as venue for first EADH Conference

ØE: to communicate results to both parties. Emphasise that all were supportive of both bids.

FC: We need to appoint a Programme Committee.

CC: Chair and members can also be someone outside the Exec.

CC: It would be great if conference PC is from a 'minor' language rather than English,.  
French, German, etc.)

EV: multilingualism should not only be for benefit of audience, but also presenters.

**ACTION POINT** (all): send recommendations for EAHD Conference PC to ØE and BB by end of week so as to have overview of possible candidates. These will then be sent to list for discussion.

EV: Should we publish papers in special volume of DSH? It could also be a thematic online issue.

ØE: There are various options. We would perhaps need to discuss with ADHO if it influences page budget.

EV: If we do it online only cost is for typesetting.

EB: In at least one proposal, if they make profit it will go to EADH. We could use it to finance such an issue.

**ACTION POINT:** EV to provide costing for publishing EADH Conference papers in DSH.

ØE: Another approach is to have extended book of abstracts. We also need to discuss abstract length.

## 14. EADH day

ØE: One proposal is that EADH Day may be superseded by conference so can this discussion leave for now.

## 15. Local/Regional DH networks

ESTONIA

LI attended a successful conference hosted by DH Estonia, a new regional organisation. There was some informal interest expressed in establishing a relationship with EADH.

ØE: possible suggestion that Baltic organisations could collaborate with DHN

**ACTION POINT** (LI): Contact DH Estonia to start conversation about potential collaboration or partnership.

OT: Hungarian colleagues are setting up a COST network but very recent so don't know details

ØE: It is good for EADH to be engaged with these networks. Encourages Exec members to establish dialogues where relevant.

LI and CT presented EADH at UK meeting at School of Advanced Study, London, to discuss potential establishment of UK DH organisation. Participants agreed that the idea should be developed further. LI and CT are involved in this group and will represent EADH as needed.

## **16. Conferences (2018 Mexico: brief update by PC members; 2019 Utrecht by FC)**

FC: DH2019 has just started. The theme has been decided.

FC: It's great to share the Chair, but also very time-consuming, because not able to take actions/send emails immediately. This can potentially cause problems but we can manage given the time frame. It has been agreed that one of the keynotes should be from Africa.

## **17. Outreach**

FC: we should renew the mailing list with members in good standing.

ØE: need to determine mechanism to keep mailing list up-to-date.

**ACTION POINT** (ØE and INFORMATION FELLOW) to set up EADH mailing list for 2018

## **19. AOB**

**Meeting closes**

### **SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS**

**ACTION POINT:** Nominations Committee to create guidelines based on previous experience with support from CC.

**ACTION POINT:** ES to produce updated membership report

**ACTION POINT:** ØE & ES: Membership needs to be a top-level category on the web page

**ACTION POINT:** (ELECTION COMMITTEE) to appoint team to get in touch with:

**ACTION POINT (ALL):** To agree on whether to accept DHR as AO.

**ACTION POINT:** EV to send link to slides from Russian DSH presentation

**ACTION POINT (all):** we each write a response to Edward's proposals for DSH reviewing policy.

**ACTION POINT:** ØE and CT to communicate with AOs about financial transfers between AOs and EADH.

**ACTION POINT (all):** send recommendations for EAHD Conference PC to ØE and BB by end of week so as to have overview of possible candidates. These will then be sent to list for discussion.

**ACTION POINT:** EV to provide costing for publishing EADH Conference papers in DSH.

**ACTION POINT (LI):** Contact DH Estonia to start conversation about potential collaboration or partnership.

**ACTION POINT (ØE and INFORMATION FELLOW)** to set up EADH mailing list for 2018