

**Society for Military History
Council Meeting
Energy, Third Floor, Norfolk Hilton
May 20, 2021/11:30 AM
Minutes**

1. Call to Order (Hall): 12:01 PM
 - A. After the luncheon, President John Hall called the meeting to order at 12:01 PM on Thursday, 20 May 2021.
2. Approval of Minutes of the Council Meetings (12 October 2020 and 2 February 2021)

Motion: Trustee Randy Papadopoulos motioned and Trustee Kathryn Barbier seconded to approve both the 12 October 2020 and 2 February 2021 Council Meeting Minutes. The Minutes were approved unanimously.

Attendees:

SMH Officers and Staff:

John Hall, President
Peter Mansoor, Vice President
Craig Felker, Executive Director
Jennifer Speelman, Vice President-Elect
Vicki Turner, Business Manager
Kurt Hackemer, Webmaster and Editor, *Headquarters Gazette*
Ashley Kumbier, Treasurer-Comptroller
Hal Friedman, Recording Secretary

Board of Trustees:

(Terms Expiring in 2021)

Beth Bailey
Huw Davies (Virtually)
Bryon Greenwald
Holly Mayer
Sarandis (Randy) Papadopoulos

(Terms Expiring in 2023)

Kathryn Barbier
David Silbey
Susannah Ural (Virtually)
Kara Vuic
Samuel Watson

(Terms Expiring in 2025)

John Curratola
Amy Fox (Virtually)
Gregory Daddis (Virtually)
Mark Grotelueschen
Daniel Krebs
Amy Rutenberg (Virtually)
Ellen Tillman

JMH Staff:

Timothy Dowling, Executive Editor
Roberta Wiener, Managing Editor and Business Manager

Graduate Student Representative:

Jessica Sheets (Outgoing)
Nathan Finney (Incoming)

SMH Meeting Coordinator:

Bryon Greenwald, Joint Forces Staff College (2021)

SMH Program Chair:

Jonathan Winkler, Wright State University (2021)

Guest:

Ashley McCoy, Cypress Planning Group

3. Introduction of VP-Elect and New Trustees (Hall)
 - A. President Hall thanked those Trustees who are completing their terms-- Beth Bailey, Huw Davies, Bryon Greenwald, Holly Mayer, Lien-Hang Nguyen, and Randy Papadopoulos--as well as outgoing Graduate Student Representative Jessica Sheets.
 - B. President Hall also welcomed incoming Vice President Jennifer Speelman; incoming Trustees John Curratola, Gregory Daddis, Amy Fox, Mark Groteluschen, Daneil Krebs, Amy Rutenberg, and Ellen Tillman; and incoming Graduate Student Representative Nathan Finney.
4. Old Business
 - A. Status on 2021 Meeting (Bryon Greenwald)
 - 1) Trustee Bryon Greenwald, 2021 SMH Annual Meeting Coordinator, spoke to the great support given to him by the SMH, by the Joint Forces Staff College, and especially by 2021 Program Chair Jonathan Winkler. He reported 315 people in physical attendance and over 300 (later revised to more than 400) in virtual attendance.
 - 2) He also thought that the SMH would financially break even or come close since it had over 600 members total in attendance.
 - 3) Finally, he spoke to the attributes of Norfolk as a site and the vital assistance given to the Society by the Hilton Main Hotel.
 - 4) President Hall thanked Greenwald, Winkler, Executive Director Craig Felker, Vice President Peter Mansoor, and Meeting IT Coordinator Maysan Haydar for the success of the conference, especially since the SMH was the only professional society this year to hold a hybrid conference with hybrid panels.
 - 5) Vice President Mansoor also noted the central importance of the efforts by Greenwald, Winkler, and Haydar in these matters.
 - 6) Vice President-Elect Jennifer Speelman asked what the biggest challenge was. Dr. Winkler answered that it was keeping the registration window open so long. Greenwald concurred.
 - 7) Trustee Randy Papadopoulos asked how many panels were virtual and Greenwald said that the balance of the panels were hybrid.
 - a) Along these lines, Greenwald said that next year there should be a penalty if people commit to a panel but then withdraw at the last

minute since this was another serious problem.

- b) Vice President Mansoor said that the intention next year was to go back to the pre-COVID model, which should obviate the problems from this year.
- c) Greenwald also said that COVID guidance was uncertain until close to the last minute.
- d) Winkler said that most of the problems were not from COVID but that the SMH needed to be careful about doing hybrid panels or a hybrid conference again. Greenwald concurred and Hall said that this would be discussed later in the meeting.
- e) Winkler also spoke about a member who would not comment on a panel because of the nature of one of the papers. He warned that the SMH needed to be careful in the future about the perception that certain topics were inappropriate because of heightened political sensibilities.

B. Other Old Business

- 1) None.

5. New Business

A. Introduction of Ashley McCoy, VP, Cypress Planning Group

- 1) Update on SMH 2022 (Forth Worth Omni, 4/28-5/01)
 - a) After being introduced by Executive Director Felker, Vice President McCoy of Cypress Planning Group spoke about her company planning the next three SMH meetings. She described Cypress Planning's function in terms of the logistical aspects of the conferences as well as her personal experience in these matters. In her hotel background, she worked earlier with the SMH at its New Orleans Annual Meeting. She stated that planning would start in June 2021 for the Fort Worth 2022 conference, with meetings at the Fort Worth Omni Hotel with Executive Director Felker in attendance.
 - b) Vice President-Elect Speelman asked about the number of per diem rooms that could be reserved for government historians. Outgoing Vice President Mansoor talked about the thirty-five rooms which had been reserved in Norfolk being an improvement over the situation in Columbus, where there were none. President Hall also spoke to government historians being able to get authorization to stay at the conference hotel at the conference rate.
 - c) McCoy talked about her firm managing about twenty functions a year and that the Fort Worth Hotel reservation site was already live.
- 2) Potential Sites for 2025
 - a) Executive Director Felker stated that the SMH was looking at Tampa for 2025.

B. Treasurer's Report/Approval of SMH Budget (Kumbier)

- 1) Kumbier spoke to COVID still having some effect on the SMH's finances but not very badly. There was a small capital loss (\$28,000) due to the turnover of Society funds into a new investment portfolio as well as a small loss in income from membership and publication. However, the SMH stayed within \$1000 of its budgeted allocations in spite of a \$20,000 loss that mainly came about because of a

reallocation of the SMH's investments. Still, she stated that investments had recovered from last year and were currently valued at \$871,000.

- a) She also noted a clean audit from last year and saw this again for this coming year, and she additionally recommended that we file our taxes earlier this coming year.
- b) Kumbier next spoke to the budget and estimated that lost membership would be regained by the next meeting. She also hoped that institutional subscriptions to the *JMH* would rebound, though she was a bit less optimistic on this account.
- c) Another new expense was the cost of Cypress Planning Group, \$1500 a month, but in return the Group would handle future conference planning per the intent of the Council.
- d) President Hall reiterated that there were no surprises with these costs and he saw COVID as a temporary problem. The SMH could afford to take a loss on the Norfolk meeting but it could not afford to skip having a meeting for a second consecutive year.
- e) Trustee-Elect Krebs asked about what was necessary in terms of the number of attendees allowing the SMH to make money on future conferences. Vice President Mansoor answered that the number varied by conference venue and budget, but 700 attendees was a reasonable figure.
- f) Dr. Felker said that by June-July, the SMH would know about the new expenses but that the conference was never intended to make money, just cover expenses and keep registration fees low. Fees would be a bit higher in 2022, but not much. Vice President Mansoor said that most people who come to the Annual Meeting are on panels, so the key is to maximize the number of panels and breakout sessions.
- g) President Hall said that the decline in membership was probably from COVID and that the Council had discussed this. He recommended technologically creating the ability for members to auto-renew in the future as a way of making renewal easier. Vice President Mansoor said that Event Rebels could not hold credit card information for renewal purposes. Treasurer-Comptroller Kumbier suggested that the SMH explore a third party app. Vice President Mansoor noted after the meeting that that apps were subsequently researched and rejected due to cost.

Motion: Trustee David Silbey motioned and Trustee Kathryn Barbier seconded to approve the 2021-2022 SMH budget. The motion passed unanimously.

C. *Journal of Military History (JMH)*

- 1) Approval of *JMH* Budget for 2021-2022 (Dowling)
 - a) President Hall talked about the relationship with Virginia Military Institute (VMI), the deaths of *JMH* Editor Bruce Vandervort and Assistant Editor Blair Turner, and the decision to reinstitute the contract with VMI.
 - b) He also spoke to how much study had been done by the Future of

the *Journal* Committee as well as how much discussion had been undertaken by the Council, especially as concerned the support pledged to the SMH by VMI given that the Adams Center would be the new home of the *JMH*.

- c) Hall expressed condolences to Vicki Turner, SMH Business Manager and wife of Blair Turner.
 - d) President Hall further noted Tim Dowling as the new Executive Editor of the *JMH*.
 - e) Dr. Dowling also spoke to the loss of Vandervort and Turner as well as the efforts to keep the *Journal* at its pace.
 - f) Vice President Mansoor asked if the Book Review Editor needed to be at VMI and Dowling spoke to the logistical advantages of having Qingfei Yin, SMH Book Review Editor, at VMI but the current impossibility of that given Yin's visa status.
 - g) Trustee Huw Davies asked about other ways in which book reviews could be completed, but Dowling noted that it was cheaper to mail hard copy books from Lexington and not London, where Yin was located.
 - h) Trustee Papadopolous asked about PDFs being used and Dowling said that some publishers were doing this during COVID, but most reviewers wanted hard copy books.
- 2) There followed questions and comments on the *JMH* budget.
- a) Vice President Mansoor noted that Dowling's salary was lower than Vandervort's, with the difference being retained by the *Journal* in Dowling's proposed budget. He said that the Society should retain control over the difference (\$16,500), since the Council was responsible for determining how to employ these additional funds.
 - b) Dowling said the difference should go to staff compensation, but Mansoor said that this was a decision for the Executive Committee. Dowling concurred in whatever process the Trustees determined.
 - c) Trustee Samuel Watson pointed out that the *JMH* reviewed more books than most journals, which needed to be taken into account when compensation was considered.
 - d) Dowling mentioned 250 reviews per year, with a total of about 400 processed books as well as accompanying emails.
 - e) Mansoor said that the discussion indicated why a specific figure should not be put in the budget.
 - f) Dowling reiterated the need to routinize this matter of compensation and that Council approval would help insure that.
- Motion: Trustee Randy Papadopoulos moved and Trustee Kathryn Barbier seconded a call for the vote. There were two votes for, six against, and four abstentions. The motion failed.**
- 3) Discussion ensued. Trustee Watson thought that the compensation could be approved in concept but then discussed in detail. President Hall reiterated that because of Yin's visa status, the SMH was getting free labor for a period of time but that compensation would come later

when her status changed.

- 4) Trustee Barbier asked why Yin would not be compensated for past labor Hall answered that previous Council discussions only addressed future compensation after her status had changed.
- 5) Trustee Holly Mayer was concerned that money was being taken away from the *Journal*, that this was a matter that was again being decided by the Executive Committee, and that this centralization was problematic. Hall answered that the SMH Constitution gave the Executive Committee the authority to make these decisions. He also said that there had to be elasticity in the budget to raise the pay for staff as they advanced in their careers.
- 6) Trustee Barbier asked if the excess funds had to go for salaries, but Vice President Mansoor said that these funds were entirely unallocated. Trustee-Elect Krebs asked if the excess funds in the budget proposal were allocated to specific line items. Executive Editor Dowling said that it was allocated for salaries, but without specifics. Mansoor proposed a new budget that took this into account by subtracting the excess \$16,500 from the budget. Barbier added that Book Review Editor compensation needed to be clarified. Hall answered that the Executive Committee would determine this at a future date.

Motion: Vice President Mansoor motioned and Trustee Barbier seconded to approve the revised 2021-2022 JHM budget. There were ten votes in favor, none opposed, and one abstention. The motion passed.

- 7) Mansoor asked when clarification on the Book Review Editor's position would be obtained and Dowling said that it would be clarified soon from Yin with a final disposition on her visa status.
- 8) Trustee Papadopoulos asked if this situation concerning the Book Review Editor's position and compensation made it more difficult for Dowling to perform his duties and Dowling said that it did not.

D. Executive Director Report (Felker)

1) Summary/Highlights

- a) Executive Director Felker first spoke to VMI's subsidy of the *Journal* since there was a gap in time between VMI's History Department relinquishing responsibility for the *JMH* and the Adams Center taking up that responsibility. Felker accordingly solved the problem by extending the History Department's period of responsibility so that the Adams Center would take over roles and functions on 1 July 2022.
- b) He additionally spoke to the heavy lifting that had to be done this year by the Council when it came to the EBSCO contract extension, the planning of the Annual Meeting, the reinstatement of the contract for the *Journal*, and the maintenance of the Society's generally good financial status. Felker additionally noted how difficult it had been to organize this conference and emphasized that this effort had been shouldered by the Executive Committee as well as Trustee Greenwald and Dr. Winkler. Felker hoped that an end to COVID

would bring more people to Forth Worth for the 2022 Annual Meeting. There were no questions at this point.

- 2) SMH 2022, 2023, 2024 Update
 - a) Felker summarized that SMH 2022 would be held in Fort Worth, Texas while SMH 2023 would be held in San Diego, California. Hotel contracts for both venues had already been signed. SMH 2024 would be in Arlington at the Crystal City Marriott, the same location as the cancelled 2020 conference.

- 3) Themes for Future SMH Conferences?
 - a) Dr. Felker wondered if a conference theme was too restrictive when it came to increasing the number of submissions to the Call for Papers.
 - b) President Hall had asked former program chairs about this. They said that themes had bound them and that no theme would lead to a stronger conference.
 - c) Trustee Barbier saw both sides of the issue but argued for a theme for purposes of conference coherence.
 - d) Trustee Watson argued that going “themeless” could still result in a strong conference and that approval rubrics could be constraining.
 - e) Vice President Mansoor suggested no theme for initial proposals but that one could be developed by the Program Committee if one developed in the course of submissions. This developed theme could then be employed in conference marketing.
 - f) Trustee Papadopoulos pointed out that the SMH had been moving to more generalized themes for two decades.
 - g) President Hall noted how themes could exclude people who really need to present that year, so outgoing Graduate Student Representative Sheets suggested tracks instead.
 - h) Trustee Susannah Ural favored cutting themes in favor of diversity and quality of scholarship while Trustee Mayer reiterated that she was in favor of tracks with some panels meeting a very general theme.
 - i) Trustee Watson liked the tracks idea and labelling those tracks afterward while Trustee-Elect Krebs suggested a 20% rubric for original research in deciding on panels and papers. He also did not think that applicants meeting a conference theme should be a major part of selection.
 - j) President Hall asked why a conference theme should be retained if it was a minor part of the selection criteria. Vice President Mansoor stated that in Columbus it was 20% of the selection rubric while Trustee Vuic noted that the rubrics changed with each year and program committee.
 - k) Trustee Silbey noted that having a theme would deter some people, but President Hall argued that the theme was primarily to produce poster art for conference advertising. He also said that with the

Cypress Group planning for us, this function of advertising might not be so central.

Motion: Trustee Randy Papadopoulos moved and Trustee Samuel Watson seconded not to have a theme with the Call for Papers for the next conference but to allow the Program Committee to develop one from the submitted papers. The motion passed with eleven votes in favor, zero against, and four abstentions.

- i) Discussion: Trustee Papadopoulos reiterated that the SMH did not need a theme for the Call for Papers. However, Trustee Barbier argued that this would be more difficult than assumed. Trustee-Elect Ellen Tillman asked if the role of the conference was to draw in new people who might need a theme. Trustee Vuic noted the method used by the Organization of American Historians of having a theme but clarifying in the Call for Papers that proposals need not fit the theme to be accepted. Trustee Papadopoulos asserted that the theme should also be consistent with what members were working on at that time. Executive Director Felker reminded the Council that whatever was passed by the Council would fall on the Fort Worth Program Committee. Trustee-Elect Krebs was opposed to a theme and he found it easier to attract sponsors without a conference theme than with one during his time as Conference Coordinator. He also pointed out that poster art would have to be done earlier than a program committee could generate it. Vice President Mansoor confirmed that everything a host used to do now had to be done by the Program Committee and reiterated how much earlier this would have to take place. Executive Director Felker, however, thought that the Cypress Planning Group had the expertise to accomplish these tasks. SMH Webmaster Kurt Hackemer noted that earlier electronic advertisement would be better with earlier artwork.
- 4) Clarity on Vandervort Articles Policy
 - a) Executive Director Felker requested clarity on the Council's intent when it voted to open the Vandervort Prize to articles published outside of the *Journal of Military History*.
 - b) Specifically, he noted that the Council:

“now recognizes at least two of the best articles published in *The Journal of Military History* during the previous calendar year, as well as up to two articles published outside of the journal. There was some discussion among the committee about how to interpret the intent of this description. We ultimately concluded that it would be best to split the award evenly between *JMH* and non-*JMH* articles.”
 - c) There was discussion between President Hall and Felker on the intent of this passage. They agreed that the intent was to honor at least two *JMH* articles, but the committee could honor more than two if outside submissions were not as worthy. Trustee Mayer agreed with Hall, and the Council agreed that that was what it originally intended.

- 5) Clarity on Millett Award
- a) Executive Director Felker provided clarity on the conditions of membership for the Millett Award.
 - b) Specifically, he noted that the Council needed:
 - “To consider: should applicants be members of the SMH? ‘We got a lot more applications this year, which is great, but a lot of those were not SMH members.’ The Council could decide to focus on the membership or to see the competition as a potential recruitment tool.”
 - c) The question was posed if an awardee had to be a member.
 - d) Trustee Watson thought so, but Vice President Mansoor asked how much the award amounted to. The answer was \$750. Trustee Mayer suggested including membership in the award. Trustee-Elect Krebs suggested graduate student membership as a criterion of application. Trustee Vuic asked for Council guidance on this matter since her committee saw it both ways when dealing with these questions. She suggested that the award be for members only since it was such a small amount of money.
 - e) Trustee Watson thought, however, that the award might bring in more members.

Motion: President John Hall moved and Trustee Holly Mayer seconded that the Millett Prize needed to be awarded to SMH members. The motion passed with one abstention.

- 6) Discussion/Vote on DEI Statement
- a) Executive Director Felker announced that the DEI Statement had been distributed to the Council electronically before the meeting.
 - b) Outgoing Graduate Student Representative Sheets asked if the SMH Conduct Policy with the following order of wording (“on the basis of actual or perceived sex, gender identity, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, socioeconomic status, age, religion, national origin, citizenship status, veteran status, or their intersection”) should match for consistency the order in the list in the SMH DEI Statement (“on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, disability, veterans’ status, and marital status as well as the various specialties, methodologies, and approaches of military history”). President Hall indicated that the Conduct Committee had accomplished this by borrowing much of its language from the statement from the University of New Hampshire.
 - c) Trustee Mayer suggested that the DEI statement either repeat or refer to the same language or initial passages in the Code of Conduct so that they mirror each other. She also stated, however, that if the present proposal was adopted that there be a reference to the Code of Conduct as to interpretation and enforcement compliance.
 - d) Trustee Silbey suggested that the DEI statement be broader than the Conduct Policy and he emphasized that the two policies needed to

be different since they governed different aspects of SMH policy.

Motion: Trustee Randy Papadopoulos moved to adopt the statement while adding librarians to the list of fields covered. Trustee David Silbey seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

E. VP/President-Elect Business

- 1) Approval of Tim Hemmis to Replace Ellen Tillman as Regional Coordinator for Region VII
 - a) Trustee-Elect Tillman spoke to Hemmis being able to fully take over, especially given his networking skills and conference organizing experience. The Council approved the change without need for a motion.
- 2) Vice President Mansoor spoke to Professor Sally Paine from the Naval War College being the 2021 Marshall Lecturer but noted that the Marshall Lecture Committee had deferred her presentation to the January 2022 American Historical Association Annual Meeting so that she could present her research in person.
- 3) Mansoor also noted the lack of funding requests from Regional Coordinators for this year because of COVID but he also pointed out that the Regional Coordinators had still been active electronically.
 - a) As an example, Executive Director Felker spoke to the Regional Coordinators being a conduit for wargaming at the United States Naval Academy when the Administration there did not prove to be very supportive of the wargaming initiative.
- 4) Membership and Staffing Report
 - a) Mansoor noted that the Membership and Staffing Committee had done a good job filling vacancies on committees and that he would make final decisions on committee volunteers in the coming weeks. He did not think that Trustee votes were needed for committee assignments but that the Trustees only needed to vote on what the Constitution required. Accordingly, the Trustees approved that they would only vote on personnel matters that the Constitution called for.
- 5) Mansoor next noted that many international colleagues wanted more mini-virtual conferences and hybrid conferences. He suggested more virtual components like the Sunday morning sessions that were free for members but included a fee for non-members.
 - a) Trustee Mayer asked if this would cause people to leave the Annual Meeting earlier and how the SMH would coordinate for different time zones. Mansoor noted that many people already departed the SMH meeting on Sunday morning and that virtual attendance would make up for lost physical participation.
 - b) Mansoor also said that the Executive Committee decided that hybrid panels were too expensive to be held in the future.
 - c) Trustee-Elect Krebs noted that face-to-face sessions on Sundays did not have good attendance and that virtual sessions might need to replace them.
 - d) Trustee-Elect John Curatola pointed out that this would also help international participants.

- e) Trustee Papadopoulos pointed out the need to analyze the desire for face-to-face sessions in the future.
- f) Trustee Silbey talked about the need to carry out this analysis for the future and in a way that would help with diversity and inclusion.
- g) Trustee Davies spoke to these points as well.
- h) Trustee Silbey also talked about limiting the number of panels to prevent too small of a face-to-face attendance at the general conference.
- i) Recording Secretary Hal Friedman warned that funding might not come back for a number of people and that it might be a fight for many members at their institutions given the hostility or indifference by many college administrations to faculty attendance at conferences.
- j) Trustee Barbier asked if the proposal was to have all of the Sunday sessions as and Mansoor said that both types could be offered, with the first morning sessions being face-to-face and second morning sessions being virtual.
- k) Barbier also suggested that the Program Committee could decide this matter.
- l) Trustee Vuic suggested that this would mean nobody but a virtual audience for those sessions, but President Hall suggested that this was probably inevitable anyway in the future.
- m) Mansoor stated with Council approval that second session Sunday panels would be virtual in Fort Worth as an experiment.

F. President Brief – Summer Seminar

- 1) President Hall spoke to the National WWII Museum hosting the resurrected SMH Summer Seminar. He related that the Executive Committee was first exploring a relationship with the Pritzker Military Museum and Library but that personnel changes there compelled the Executive Committee to consider partners other than Pritzker. According to President Hall, Executive Director Felker suggested the WWII Museum as the host. Hall reached out and worked especially with Nick Mueller, the CEO *Emeritus*, and Mueller was very interested in doing this.
- 2) According to Hall, a pilot program would take place in Summer 2022 and would be different from the Pritzker arrangement in that the Museum had more staff, more exhibits, more holdings, their own hotel, and a professional staff to carry out the necessary tasks. Hall emphasized that the Museum's administrative capabilities would be key to the success of the Institute, which is what made the Museum the preferred partner.
- 3) Hall also reminded the Trustees that they had a report from him about the efforts by the Ad Hoc Committee with Pritzker and now the Museum. This report included the three-week outline of the intended curriculum and he emphasized that the Museum was on board even though the three-week curriculum of the Institute was not entirely devoted to World War II.
- 4) Along these lines, he stated that there was a Memorandum of

- Understanding (MOU) between the SMH and the Museum that was to be signed so that both organizations could move ahead on developing the the program. Then, the idea was to propose to the Smith-Richardson Foundation that it fund a pilot program for one year.
- 5) Hall also said that there would be a joint committee with eight members, four from the SMH and four from the Museum. For the pilot program, the SMH could choose the Director and the Executive Committee chose Trustee-Elect Gregory Daddis. The Museum was to choose the Associate Director, who would be Senior Historian Rob Citino. Hall additionally stated that the Program Director would have the ability to design the curriculum as he saw fit but that he would also work for the Museum while accomplishing this.
 - 6) In addition, Hall said that the Museum would be the legal and fiscal controller of the Summer Institute since it was carrying out the administrative tasks. It was also claiming intellectual property rights over the program's materials, though the material would be dual-branded so that the SMH would also have permanent access to program materials that were generated.
 - 7) Trustee Vuic stated that there needed to be much more discussion about the control of intellectual property and the idea of limiting participants to new PhDs and mid-career scholars.
 - 8) Hall agreed about these matters as did Trustee-Elect Daddis. Hall also emphasized that these building blocks were necessary to create programs from year to year with the flexibility that would be needed in future years.
 - 9) Hall further emphasized that the Trustees did not have to decide on any of these matters during the Annual Meeting, but that it could vote to approve the MOU if it felt comfortable doing so within the limited time to review it.
 - 10) Vice President Mansoor asked what would prevent the Museum from divorcing the SMH from the arrangement at a later date.
 - 11) Hall said that this would have to be made clearer in the final document, especially in terms of SMH access to Museum-owned materials. He also argued that as long as the SMH retained future access, the problem should be resolved.
 - 12) Trustee Silbey pointed out that the use of materials by college and university professors needed to be carefully considered given how aggressive these institutions were becoming about intellectual property.
 - 13) Hall said that Dr. Mueller, Museum CEO *Emeritus*, could answer these questions, but that if sole control by the Museum was insisted on, it would be a deal breaker for the SMH.
 - 14) As an example of the potential problem, SMH Webmaster Hackemer noted that a college or university could assert copyright over material developed by one of their personnel for the Summer Institute.
 - 15) Trustee Silbey compared this situation to a professor not being able to have their name on a publication.
 - 16) Trustee Ural asked the same as well as asking about how participants in

- the program would be selected. Hall said the joint committee would create selection criteria but that full agreement needed to be determined. He saw the same process being employed as had been carried out for the West Point program.
- 17) Trustee-Elect Krebs asked about the ability to use these materials if the materials were from Federal systems, but Trustee Watson noted that private institutions would have different rules. Hall asked to table this matter until Mueller was brought into the meeting.
 - 18) Trustee Silbey asked again what the purpose of the Seminar was given the modern and Western focus of it. Trustee-Elect Daddis thought that there was flexibility to change it in the future, but the purpose was to urge participants to think not so much about content but how effectively military history was being taught. Hall noted that Zoom presentations could be used to supplement or augment the program with presenters and materials from other areas of specialization. In addition, Program and Associate Program Directors would necessarily have different emphases on aspects such as specialties, time periods, and geographical foci.
 - 19) Dr. Mueller joined the meeting and Hall asked what the Museum wanted and needed when it came to intellectual property. Mueller replied that the Museum requested this control of all speakers and presenters at all of the Museum's functions. He emphasized that this was boilerplate for the Museum and he also said that it had not been a problem thus far. He even pointed out that Arizona State University (ASU) had the property rights on the joint MA program which the Museum had developed with the University.
 - 20) Mueller reconfirmed that this was boiler plate language and more refined language might need to be discussed. Vice President Mansoor related that a professor's materials had to remain theirs. Here, Mueller talked about access as opposed to ownership being the point of the MOU.
 - 21) Dr. Hackemer reemphasized that annual questions were asked of his university's faculty about material they were presenting elsewhere. Trustee Ural further noted that videos, slides, and most materials were likely to be a problem.
 - 22) Mueller said that this material would not be produced for profit, but Trustee Mayer also said that the use of articles and books would need copyright permission. She said that for this reason she had at times refused recordings of her presentations. Mueller said that no one so far had refused one of the Museum's requests for a recording but he also emphasized that the Museum needed to take this step for its own protection. If a presenter did not want to be recorded, they would probably not be asked to speak at the Museum.
 - 23) Vice President Mansoor asked how much of the Summer Seminar would be recorded, but Mueller said that that had not yet been determined.
 - 24) Trustee Silbey asked what the Museum's vision was for the Seminar and how the Seminar would add to the Museum's mission. Mueller

reminded the Council that the Society had approached the Museum, not the other way around, and that the Museum's mission was to essentially tell a 20th Century story of the war. According to Mueller, the SMH program tied into making military history accessible to the public and American society, which was the Museum's primary mission. Training professors in teaching effective military history would assist in that process.

- 25) Trustee Watson asked for and received confirmation that there would be no more than thirty participants in each seminar, but President Hall said that the initial number for a seminar would probably be twenty. He also re-emphasized that there was no pressure for the Trustees to approve anything today. The only thing potentially to be approved today was the MOU, which would merely be a joint agreement to continue discussions.

Motion: President John Hall called for a motion to approve the initial MOU, pending legal review by SMH counsel. Trustee David Silbey moved and Trustee Huw Davies seconded. The motion passed with eleven votes for, two abstentions, and none against.

- 26) Trustee Ural asked if the SMH was going too fast in this matter but Trustee Silbey answered that this was just a measure taken so that both organizations could go forward in the process. The SMH could withdraw if need be.
- 27) Vice President-Elect Speelman asked about the hesitation and Ural noted the advantage that the Museum could obtain from the SMH.
- 28) Trustee Vuic also had significant concerns, especially about intellectual property rights. However, she also thought that it was worth cautiously pursuing a relationship. She therefore thought that the MOU could be approved. Trustee Daddis concurred.
- 29) Trustee Ural asked why the memo was needed. Hall said that the Museum wanted it in order to reflect the work that it had already put into this effort. He emphasized that the MOU was merely a gesture of good faith on the SMH's part.
- 30) Mansoor re-emphasized that the MOU was a non-binding agreement.
- 31) Trustee Watson asked about the effect of delaying on this matter and if the Museum would take a delay as undiplomatic. He also pointed out that the Council was going to change in composition after the Annual Meeting.
- 32) Trustee Barbier confirmed that since the SMH was not bound by the MOU, delay would not be to the SMH's advantage.
- 33) SMH Webmaster Hackemer suggested that an MOU could be more binding, but Hall said that this was not a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and the non-binding language of the MOU was very specific.
- 34) Trustee Mayer recommended that if the SMH went ahead, it should have dates for goals, objectives, and methods. She therefore recommended that the SMH not delay signing the MOU.
- 35) Vice President-Elect Speelman noted that the Museum might just be used to dealing with K-12 districts rather than colleges when it

came to intellectual property rights.

G. Other Presidential Matters Achieved

- 1) President Hall then reviewed the other matters that had been solved during his tenure as SMH President, namely the conduct policy, the onboarding handbook, the new membership and staffing procedures, the future of the *Journal*, and Constitutional revisions.

H. Executive Session

- 1) The Council in Executive Session decided to forgo staff pay raises due to the financial uncertainty of the pandemic. The Council also agreed to offer Executive Director C.C. Felker a four-year extension on his contract, which currently expires in March 2022.

6. Adjournment

- A. President Hall spoke finally to the labor of love that being the President entailed.
- B. President-Elect Mansoor thanked him for his leadership, especially given the pandemic. Mansoor stated specifically that the Society was blessed with Hall's leadership.
- C. The Council adjourned at 5:12 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,



Hal M. Friedman, Recording Secretary
20 May 2021