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Preface

How to Update the Manual

The Operations Manual is an in-house, evolving document that will have to be updated as practices, policies, and documents change. The version of the Manual that “lives” on the SCE website as a PDF file should always be regarded as the authoritative version. To prevent the problem of too many cooks spoiling the stew and to prevent the development of multiple non-standard versions of the document, here are the procedures for amending and updating it:

1. The Executive Administrator may make needed changes at any time that there is a new action by the Board of Directors or a need to update a document that is included in the Manual (for example, the Appendix of Registration and Membership Statistics will need to be updated annually). The Executive Administrator will also maintain (and back up) the master Microsoft Word file from which the PDF was made.

2. The Executive Officers may propose and introduce appropriate changes at any time either by (1) asking the Executive Administrator to make the changes or (2) by requesting the master Microsoft Word document from the Executive Administrator, making the changes directly, using track changes, and returning the updated text to the Executive Administrator for conversion to a new PDF file for the website. In the latter case, the Executive Administrator reviews the changes, makes sure that they do not impact other elements of the Manual (making correlative changes as needed), accepts the changes, posts the revised PDF file, and notifies those who have access to the Manual that the text has been altered (because if they have downloaded the Manual, they will now need to download the revised version). N.B. The posted text of the Manual will always need to carry a header saying “PDF version created [full date]” to prevent the confusion that will arise if individuals are working with different versions.

3. Every year, usually in June, the persons specified on The Table of Contents page will review the sections of the Manual that are their responsibility. They will either (1) make written recommendations to the Executive Administrator about needed changes or, if provided with the Microsoft Word file, (2) make changes to the document directly, using track changes, and return the revised document to the Executive Administrator. In the latter case, the Executive Administrator reviews the changes, makes sure that they do not impact other elements of the Manual (and adjusts text as needed if they do), and accepts the changes. Once all the necessary reviews have taken place, the Executive Administrator incorporates all the revisions into a new PDF file for the website and notifies users of the Manual that the new version is available.

The following two year table allows the Executive Administrator to record any updates that have been made. For interim updates, enter the surname and date of changes in the row for the section that has been updated. For the annual review, in the “June” column for the year, enter initials to indicate who has performed the review; note, “no changes” or “changes made” as appropriate.
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1. Mission: Who We Are

The purpose of the Society is to promote scholarly work in Christian ethics and in the relation of Christian ethics to other traditions of ethics; to promote the relation of Christian ethics to social, economic, political and cultural problems; to encourage and improve the teaching of these fields in colleges, universities and theological schools; and to provide a community of discourse and debate for those engaged professionally within these general fields.

A non-denominational scholarly association founded in 1959, the Society of Christian Ethics draws its approximately 850 members primarily from the faculties of universities, colleges, and theological schools primarily in the United States, Canada, and Europe. Doctoral students at these schools are also eligible for membership. The vitality of the Society of Christian Ethics reflects the maturing academic discipline of Christian ethics.

Membership statistics are prepared annually by the Executive Administrator; the most recent summary is included in Governance Appendix A.6.

The SCE promotes research in the history of ethics and moral theology; theoretical issues relating to the interplay of theology and ethics; methodology in ethical reflection and investigation; and comparative religious ethics. At the same time, the Society addresses, in national and global contexts, problems in applied and professional ethics and various human rights and social justice issues. Internally, the SCE endorses and practices the highest standards of professional and scholar conduct, under the oversight of a Professional Conduct Policy and Committee.

Membership in the Society is open to persons in the following groups: (1) college, university, or seminary teachers of Christian ethics or social ethics; (2) persons teaching in similar institutions in other fields who are concerned with the relation of Christian ethics to their subject matter; (3) persons whose full-time professional work in church, government, social agency or elsewhere is related to the purposes of the Society. Candidates for membership must have at least one of the following: a Ph.D. or equivalent degree, or scholarly publications in the above-named fields, or a full-time teaching position in ethics or related fields in an accredited institution of higher learning. Doctoral students in ethics or related fields may become members of the Society upon matriculation into a doctoral program. This status ordinarily may be retained for not more than ten years.
2. History of SCE

For a much more detailed and extensive account of the origins and evolution of the Society, see Academic Bonding and Social Concern. This volume (now out of print but available in many libraries and on our website history section) was prepared in 1983 by Edward LeRoy Long Jr. for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Society. It was published in 1984 with help from the Journal of Religious Ethics under the imprint of Religious Ethics, Inc., available with permission at https://scethics.org/academic-bonding-and-social-concern-society-christian-ethics-1959-1983.

Material included here is also drawn from a brief history written by Edward Long and Christine Gudorf for the CSSR Bulletin 32:2 (2003).

The Society of Christian Ethics currently has approximately 850 members primarily from among ethics professors in universities, colleges and seminaries, but also including persons whose work involves social policy analysis and/or social policy responsibilities in other settings. The Society grew out of meetings of Protestant seminary professors of ethics who met together several times without a formal charter in the 1950s as an Association of Seminary Professors of Christian Social Ethics. Those early meetings were attended by a small group of one to two dozen persons (estimated to be about a fifth of the persons in the field at the time), and were held in academic settings, including Yale Divinity School, Union Theological Seminary in New York, the College of Preachers in Washington, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Western Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh and Eastern Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. The Edward W. Hazen Foundation provided a grant of approximately $350 each year to subsidize attendees’ travel and housing expenses.

The Society’s name has changed over its lifetime. Through special efforts made by Professor Das Kelley Barnett (its most energetic sponsor) to obtain a larger participation in the life of the association by seminary professors, a larger, more structured organization was created at a meeting at Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington in January 1959. That group adopted the new name The American Society of Christian Social Ethics. Five years later the adjective Social was dropped amid some debate, following the argument that all ethics is social in nature. The adjective American was dropped in 1980 because it was recognized that a significant number of the Society’s members were Canadian. Since 1980 the name, Society of Christian Ethics, has remained unchanged.

History of Membership

The membership of the Society has changed over the years not only in size but also in composition, especially its gender and denominational composition. At the very start the membership was almost completely male and was drawn largely from those teaching in seminaries, including many clergy. The 1960 membership roster listed 116 men and 1 woman. By 1964 there were 140 members, including 2 women; at the twenty-fifth anniversary in 1983 there were 664 members, about 50 of whom were women. In June 2016, 31 percent of the members are women. In the first years the membership was predominantly white. There were six African-American members in 1960 and fifteen by 1983. Membership statistics for December 2015 show that persons of color constitute about 13 percent of the total membership (17 percent did not answer the question; 70 percent self-identify as Caucasian) but 27 percent of the student members.

During the first 25 years of the Society’s existence nearly 45 percent of the members were located in the East (New England, Middle and South Atlantic states) and about 12 percent were located in the West (Mountain and Pacific Coast States). In 2016, almost 6 percent of the membership is
from 22 international countries, 40 percent from Eastern US states, 43 percent from the Central US States, and 11 percent from the Western US states.

Although the Society began mainly as a gathering of faculty teaching in seminaries and theological schools, by the 25th anniversary in 1983, members who were teaching in college or university departments of religion outnumbered members from seminaries. The proportion of university faculty has continued to gradually rise since then as public universities began to develop departments of religious studies.

One of the most significant developments has been the shift from the early almost completely Protestant composition of the Society to one that now includes a large number of Roman Catholics (both priests and lay theologians), several Orthodox Christians, and a small number of Jewish scholars. After Vatican II, a few Roman Catholic moral theologians began to attend the meetings, and the number of Roman Catholics who became members grew steadily. From 1963 on, Catholic membership grew to become by far the largest single denomination represented in the SCE.

As the number of Jewish members increased and interest in Jewish Ethics grew, a Working Group for the Study of Jewish ethics was formed. In 2003, the Society of Jewish Ethics (SJE) was independently incorporated as a scholarly association. The SJE continues to meet at the same time and in the same hotel that hosts the annual meeting of the SCE. The SCE Working Group on Muslim Ethics similarly fostered the formation of an independent scholarly association, The Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics (SSME), which was incorporated in 2009. The SSME also meets at the same time and in the same hotel as the SCE. The three societies offer joint membership, and the SCE executive administrator provides administrative support to the two sister societies.

See Governance Appendix A.6 for the most recent membership statistics.

**History of Governance**

The governance of the Society evolved slowly at first. Bylaws were drafted in 1961 and adopted in 1964. The bylaws provided for the following elected officials: a president and a vice president who serve for one year; twelve directors, three elected each year to serve a term of four years; and an executive secretary (since 1994 called the Executive Director) appointed by the Board for a term of five years.

During the early years, nominations for these positions were drawn up at the annual meeting by a committee which met on location and submitted a slate which contained no alternative choices. Nominations from the floor were allowable, but were seldom made. As the Society became larger and more diverse, elections changed. Beginning in 1975 multiple choices were offered for membership on the Board of Directors, and since 1977 at least two names have been submitted each year for the vice presidential office—the presumptive president the following year. Currently, the Nominating Committee is selected a year in advance and submits its slate of candidates to the membership months before the annual meeting.

The presidencies of Cathleen Kaveny, William Schweiker, and Cristina Traina have seen further developments in the governance structure of the Society. Three sequential ad hoc Presidential Committees (two chaired by Robin Lovin and one chaired by Doug Ottati) produced a multi-year study of the Society’s administrative needs in light of (1) the Society’s own growth, complexity, and administrative burden, (2) the emergence of two sister societies partly administered through the SCE, (3) universities’ devaluation of faculty service to scholarly societies, and (4) universities’
disinclination to subsidize scholarly societies with office space and clerical support. See the section on Strategic Planning Initiatives below for a more detailed discussion of these committees; the committee reports are available in Governance Appendix A.5. In 2015 the Society decided to move to a four-year Presidential Cabinet (Vice President, President Elect, President, and Past President), with 2016 as the first year with four officers in the line of succession. Beginning in 2017, the nominations committee will each year place the names of two members in nomination for the office of Vice President. The member elected to that office will then automatically become President Elect and so advance through a four-year term of service. Additional nominations for Vice President continue to be allowed from the floor. This four-year structure provides greater continuity in the governance of the Society and also facilitates planning for and meeting the Society's present and future needs.

During this same period, the governance role of the Board was expanded through the creation of three working committees of the Board. Board members are assigned to one of these committees when they are first elected to the Board and remain a member of that committee throughout their four-year term. This, too, provides for greater continuity and fosters the development of expertise for responsible management of the Society’s affairs. In their last year on the Board, the members normally chair the committee in which they have participated for the previous three years, and these committee chairs also serve on the executive committee.

In 2015 the Presidential Cabinet and the Board’s Finance and Long-term Planning Committee developed a contractual agreement with the Executive Administrator. The Personnel Committee of the Board has the responsibility for overseeing the work and performance of the Executive Director for Strategic Planning, the Executive Administrator, the Treasurer, and the Co-Editors of the JSCE.

History of Annual Meetings

While the Society has always met in January, the date has shifted from late January to an earlier weekend, now carefully chosen to avoid Martin Luther King Jr.’s birthday. The program has grown larger and more complex, and the length of the meeting has grown longer over the years. The first several meetings involved only an overnight stay and consisted of three or four plenary sessions. In the last few years the length of the meeting has expanded to a full two-and-a-half days with auxiliary meetings both before and after the formal program. The total number of participants, both presenters and conveners, on the program has also increased. In the early years the number was in the teens; a decade later, in the thirties; by the mid 1970s in the sixties. The highest number of participants in the first twenty-five years was 111. The Society now must hold its meetings in large hotels with conference facilities rather than on campuses. Attendance is now around 500.

The substantive content of the annual programs across the years has been rich and varied, so much so that it is difficult to give a simple overview. The themes of several books that became classics after publication were first shared with the Society as papers. Probably the greatest number of papers have dealt with foundational issues—that is, consideration of the biblical, historical, philosophical, theological and social-scientific grounding of the discipline, as well as debates in moral theory..

A significant number of papers have sought to understand oppression and to suggest ways to overcome it. These papers have dealt with: (1) racism and African-American liberation; (2) Latin American and Asian-American scholarship, (3) feminism and the oppression of women; (4)
LGBTQIA matters, and (5) the situation of Native Americans, both in the United States and in Canada.

From the early years onward, issues of war and peace have appeared prominently on the program, although the delineation of the issues has changed over the years. Nuclear weaponry, deterrence theory, just war teaching, the relevance of the pacifist witness, the legitimacy of intervention, and the problem of violence in general have all been discussed both as abstract theory and as current policy issues. Such discussions have occurred from the very first years.

Many members of the Society have been interested in the nature and function of law, an interest that extends into and relates to the study of political action and the protection of human rights. An equally important focus of attention has been economics, including globalization, technology, and the care of the environment. Biomedical ethics has been prominent on the program, engaging both professors and members employed in the healthcare sector. A scattering of papers have dealt with the relation between ethics and liturgy, and of ethics with higher education. Sexuality has been a recurring topic, and attention to it has increased, mirroring its prominence in ecclesial and social discussions.

Program sessions have provided for dialogue between Protestants and Roman Catholics, between those in Western and Eastern branches of Christianity, and between Christians and Jews. Some attention, modest but increasing in amount and importance over the years, has been devoted to understanding ethical thinking in other religions of the world.

In recent years, the annual meeting has been enriched by meeting jointly with the Society for Jewish Ethics (SJE) and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics (SSME). The program provided to SCE members also includes the full programs of the two concurrently meeting sister societies. The program includes three plenary addresses; speakers for two of these plenaries are invited by the SCE President, and the speaker for the third plenary is invited, in alternating years, by the SJE President or the SSME President.

**History of Strategic Planning Initiatives**

**Committee for the Twenty-First Century**

The Committee for the Twenty-First Century was initiated by President Ronald M. Green as communicated in a letter to the members of the Society of Christian Ethics, dated October 16, 1998. The stated purpose of the committee was to think about the current status and future directions of the Society as its members approached the beginning of a new millennium and the fortieth anniversary of the Society. The committee was charged by President Green to address the evolving needs of our scholarly field by considering the following and related issues: the Society’s mission, likely changes in size and membership base, format of the annual meeting, governance structure, and access to new communication technologies to enhance the work of the Society. President Green invited all members of the Society to nominate Society members for service on this committee and to send nominations to him or to Dennis McCann, Executive Director. The Committee was asked to express its work in the form of recommendations. The members of the committee, approved by the Board of Directors at the 1999 Annual Meeting, are these: June O’Connor, Chair; Timothy Beach-Verhey, Frederick Bird, Audrey Chapman, Miguel De La Torre, Ronald M. Green, Christine Gudorf, Simeon Ilesanmi, Timothy Jackson, John Langan, Dennis McCann, Gene Outka, William Schweiker, Ruth Smith, Emilie Townes, Cristina Traina, Darryl Trimiew, Sumner Twiss, Louke Van Wensveen, Allen Verhey, and Sondra Wheeler.
Four subcommittees were formed, a survey instrument was designed that gave all members input, and recommendations emerged. The Initiative chose to foster conversations with ethicists in other cultures, traditions, and institutional settings. The committee’s study reaffirmed the basic identity and practice of the Society at the same time that it clarified a number of shifts that had taken place within that identity and pointed to some necessary adaptations to changed conditions in the Society and the larger community. A number of the changes that the 21st Century Committee Report recommended have been implemented, including a Society website (www.scethtics.org) listing annual meetings, programs, Presidential addresses, a searchable but not downloadable directory of members, email and listserv information, and subscription information for the JSCE. Recognizing the increased size of the Society, a half-day extension of the annual meeting was recommended and implemented, as was a suggested writers’ group. The most ambitious proposal was the establishment and funding of four Working Groups with four-year mandates to cultivate conversations and working relationships focused on Hispanic Christian Ethics, African and African-American Christian Ethics, Jewish and Christian Ethics, and Islamic and Christian Ethics. Partly as a result of this proposal the newly formed Society of Jewish Ethics met in conjunction with the SCE in 2003, with its program coordinated with that of the SCE and printed in the SCE program.

Over the ensuing decades, the Initiatives have encouraged the formation of these groups and associations:

- Three Working Groups, to enhance the visibility and contribution of emerging constituencies within Christian ethics: the African-American and African (since 2003), Latino/a (since 2007), and Asian and Asian-American (since 2008);
- Two academic associations which now meet conjointly with the SCE: the Society of Jewish Ethics (since 2003) and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics (beginning in 2010).

For the full text of the Committee’s report, see Reports Appendix F.1.

The Lovin and Ottati Reports to the Board

Between January 2013 and January 2015, three different ad hoc Presidential committees met to consider the needs of the Society in light of changes in the Society itself (growth, financial matters, and the emergence of sister societies meeting conjointly with the SCE) and changes in the climate of institutions of higher learning which, as a general matter, have shifted dramatically from rewarding service to rewarding publications and which, again as a general matter, have become significantly less willing to subsidize the activities of professional societies with office space and clerical support.

The first Committee on the Structure of the SCE was appointed near the end of January 2013 and was asked to submit a report at the time of the spring executive committee meeting in April 2013. This committee was chaired by Doug Ottati, and has sometimes been called “The Ottati Report.” The committee comprised M. Cathleen Kaveny, Peter Paris, and Gina Wolfe. The Committee did its work in the very brief time allotted, gathering historical information and making both short-term and long-term recommendations. Among other things, they recommended “that a subsequent committee be appointed to undertake a study of long-term organizational possibilities, ranging from a revision and clarification of the current structure to restructuring the organization to outsourcing a number of administrative functions.”

President Verhey then, in August 2013, did appoint a second committee, the Organizational Options Committee. This committee was chaired by Robin Lovin and comprised Peter Paris, Gina Wolfe, and Diane Yeager. It submitted its relatively brief report in March 2014. This committee
(sometimes called the Lovin I Committee) recommended a study of the administrative structures of other comparable professional societies, but also recommended that the current staff structure be replaced by a single, new, paid staff position that would consolidate responsibilities that were currently divided among offices. The committee recommended that the proposed new position be filled by a “full-time administrative professional, provided by the Society with a salary commensurate to experience and responsibilities.” Acknowledging that this report was not “a blueprint, but a suggestion for further development,” the committee noted that if the Board were to accept their recommendations and move toward implementation, “a good deal of further work would be required.”

To do that work, a third committee was appointed. Robin Lovin was again persuaded to serve as chair, and this committee is sometimes called the Organizational Options Committee (2014) and is sometimes called the Lovin II Committee. The members of this committee were Doug Ottati, Peter Paris, and Gina Wolfe. This Committee submitted its report to the Board in January 2015 with the following recommendation:

To meet our organizational needs for the future, we propose 1) a change in both the structure and the culture of the Society that concentrates executive leadership in the elected presidential leadership and the Board of Directors. We also propose 2) a phasing out of the positions of Executive Director and Associate Executive Director, and 3) consolidation of administrative functions in a single office of Administrative Director, who would be a full-time employee of the Society, provided with working space, support services, and appropriate structures and procedures for supervision and evaluation. The transition to this new model is itself a complex executive and administrative task, and we recommend 4) that it be carried out with appropriate care to document the existing policies and procedures of the Society and to provide for organizational continuity through future changes in personnel.

The report goes on to discuss Executive Leadership (the initiation of a 4-year presidential line), Administrative Leadership (the consolidation of staff support into a single professional paid position of Administrative Director), and transitional issues. The report includes a discussion of the changes in the bylaws that would be necessary to support the new arrangements for governance.

When the report of this third committee was presented to the Board, it was accompanied by a memo jointly authored by Cathleen Kaveny (the President for 2014) and William Schweiker (the President for 2015) in which they outline the means by which the Society can move forward in the transition that all three Presidential Committees judged to be necessary and inevitable.

For the full text of the reports of all three of these committees, as well as the Kaveny/Schweiker memo, see Governance Appendix A.5

2020 Future of Christian Ethics Committee

President Stanley Hauerwas appointed the 2020 Committee on the Future of Christian Ethics with Charles Mathewes as chair. The Committee completed a report in December 2013 that was the product of several years’ work on the part of the members of the committee. This report was meant to be a conversation-starter, not a final statement of the Society’s considered views. The work of this committee provided the Society an opportunity for a renewal of our ongoing conversations about what Christian ethics is, what it ought to be, and how it could get from the former to the latter.
In order better to inform and guide the actions of the Society in years to come, the 2020 Committee explored the current status of, and future prospects for, Christian ethics as a field of scholarship and teaching in the academy.

The Committee had two objectives. First, it sought to understand, using all possible evidence, the current state of the field of Christian ethics — in terms of its pedagogical, intellectual, and institutional presence in the academy; in terms of its vocation (both pedagogically and institutionally) in churches and ecclesial bodies; and in terms of its vocation in public life, conceived broadly. Second, it sought to use that understanding to offer tentative practical recommendations regarding how best to commit the resources of the Society to the present encouragement, and future cultivation, of the field of Christian ethics in the academy, for the churches, and amidst the public.

See Reports Appendix F.2 for the report and responses to it.

History of the Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics (JSCE)

Early in its history the Society developed its own publishing agenda, aspiring to produce a journal of high scholarly quality to be published on a regular schedule. It was a long time before this ideal came to fruition. Several committees were formed during the 1960s to consider publication possibilities, and the first effort was a newsletter. Subsequent publications included bibliographical essays on specific topics, the first of which was on Black studies. The Society also began to distribute mimeographed minutes and selected papers.

By 1975 the Society had begun to produce a printed volume entitled The Selected Papers. By 1981, this publication was renamed The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics, and an editor was appointed by the Board to serve a three-year (later five-year) term. The Editor appointed an Editorial Board from the membership of the Society. During this period the Society initiated a contract with Georgetown University Press to print and distribute the publication.

From its inception, The Annual was a refereed selection from among the papers delivered at the annual meeting. In addition to the selection process that chose papers for the program from all the proposals submitted, the editor of The Annual appointed at least two referees to both read and hear all papers whose authors indicated a willingness to have their manuscripts considered for publication. Because the selected papers were usually published in less than a year, most presenters took advantage of the opportunity to submit manuscripts. As the number of papers delivered at annual meetings increased over the years, the number of pages in The Annual increased as well. In 1996 the editorship became a co-editorship and at the end of that five-year term, another team of co-editors was appointed. By 2001, the size of The Annual was fast approaching 500 pages. With the support of the Report of the 21st Century Committee in 2002, The Annual became the Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics (JSCE). In 2003, while continuing in its relationship with Georgetown University Press, the JSCE began publishing two issues a year, shifted from camera-ready to type-set publishing, and made plans for a book review section.

Every essay published in the JSCE is currently accessible electronically through databases (ATLA, JSTOR, and MUSE). This electronic dissemination has notably expanded the reach of the Society’s scholarship.
During these years, the Society played a supportive role in the birth of two other scholarly journals. Member Charles Reynolds, with support from the University of Tennessee, undertook to publish a *Journal of Religious Ethics (JRE)* and asked the Society to provide active encouragement for the venture; the Society responded with a small grant (1973). The initial Editor, Associate Editors, and Editorial Board were almost all members of the Society, but the *JRE* incorporated independently. Ten years later (1983), the Society provided a small grant to help launch *The Journal of Law and Religion*, which, like the *JRE*, has maintained friendly but unofficial ties to the Society. The Society also provided a small grant to the *Religious Studies Review* (1975).

As the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Society approached in 1983, Edward LeRoy Long Jr. was asked to write a history of the Society, which he titled *Academic Bonding and Social Concern*. This was prepared in camera-ready form on a then quite primitive computer and was published in 1984 with help from the *Journal of Religious Ethics* and under the imprint of Religious Ethics, Inc. Now out of print, this history can still be accessed in libraries and at [https://scethics.org/academic-bonding-and-social-concern-society-christian-ethics-1959](https://scethics.org/academic-bonding-and-social-concern-society-christian-ethics-1959).

**Affiliations**

At the end of its first decade the SCE explored the possibility of becoming a member of the American Council of Learned Societies. It was discouraged from going forward with a formal application by the then President of the ACLS on the ground that the range of the Society’s interest was too narrow and its identity was not yet fully defined. The ACLS was also reluctant to grant membership to just one of the many professional groups concerned with aspects of religious studies. Moreover, the American Academy of Religion was emerging at the time as the presumptive parent group for all aspects of religious studies and hence would have been a more natural choice for ACLS. Over the years many members of the SCE have participated in the ethics section of the American Academy of Religion, but there has never been a formal working agreement between the two societies.

That rebuff did not deter the SCE from working with other learned societies in subsequent years. It became very active early in the creation of the Council for the Study of Religion, and several of its delegates to that body have been elected to key offices. The SCE had a role in the International Congress of Learned Societies in the Field of Religion that was held in Los Angeles in September of 1972 but declined to move its annual meeting that year to coincide with that of the Congress. Similar informal interchange occurred over the years between the SCE and the Society for Values in Higher Education.

The Society has been a member of the National Humanities Alliance since 1981. From 1970 to 2009, the Society was a member of the Council of Societies for the Study of Religion.

**Public Witness**

Historically, the primary purpose of the Society has always been to support and encourage academic achievement, but from time to time its members have become so concerned about a public issue as to consider taking a stand. This has often prompted a discussion about the appropriateness of doing so, but when a glaring social problem arises the reservations are occasionally set aside. A member of the Society was pivotal in getting the session which the SCE sponsored at the Congress of Religion (Los Angeles, 1971) to pass a resolution criticizing the American bombing of North Vietnam. The Board sent greetings in 1971 to the American Civil Liberties Union on its fiftieth anniversary. In 1971, when the trial of Father Berrigan and others took place, the Society created a task force to consider the threat to academic freedom and civil
liberties. The task force polled the membership for ideas and reactions and eventually a paper was written which was printed by the Department of Church and Society of the Presbyterian Church with the title “U.S. vs. the Harrisburg 8: Conspiracy Persecution for Illegal Dissent.”

The Society made its voice heard in urging the nation’s bicentennial celebration to avoid becoming a self-congratulatory binge. It passed a resolution supporting the move to make Martin Luther King’s birthday a national holiday (1978). It publicly supported both academic freedom and its past president, Charles Curran, in his dismissal from The Catholic University of America (1980), expressed deep concern over the Vatican’s treatment of Hans Küng (1980), and expressed opposition to a surge of militant racism. More recently it opposed the 1991 Gulf War (1991), and defended needle exchange programs to prevent the spread of AIDS (2000). The society expressed its solidarity with its sister society, the SSME, and condemned anti-Muslim rhetoric and violence (2016). The presidential cabinet in 2016 concluded that a more formal resolution review process is needed, and will be proposing such a process to the Board in January 2017.

When the 4-H Center in Washington, which had been the SCE’s single most frequent meeting site, closed its doors to Amnesty International and to a group that accepted gay and lesbian members, the Board decided not to meet there again unless the Center revised its policy. One of the most thoroughly considered and important actions of the Society with regard to the conduct of its own life was to draft a policy in 1997 concerning sexual conduct which provided sanctions against members engaging in any misconduct while participating in the Society’s life, a policy later in 2001 incorporated into a broader policy covering all aspects of professional conduct.

### Scholarship and Family Care

The Women’s Caucus of the Society of Christian Ethics has responded to the changes in the shape and demography of the academy in light of the increasing number of women scholars. Currently, the task of balancing family and career tends to fall disproportionately to women. Childbearing, childbirth, child rearing, child care, care for dependent relatives with disabilities or medical needs, and elder care are all “family” related responsibilities predominantly shouldered by women.

The Women’s Caucus has challenged the Society of Christian Ethics to promote the adoption of policies and guidelines that foster family-friendly departments and thereby positively contribute to increased diversity within the field. Fostering more family-friendly departments directly impacts common academic life and the ability of the SCE to fulfill its mission: As institutions of higher education seek to hire and retain high quality faculty, they compete not only with other colleges and universities but also with employers outside the academy. In fact, research suggests that institutions that do not accommodate family caregiving suffer in the competitive academic workplace.

See [Reports Appendix F.3](#) and [Reports Appendix F.4](#) for more information on “Enabling a Family-Friendly Institution” and “Balancing Scholarship with Family Care.”
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3. Membership

The Society of Christian Ethics welcomes new members once a year at the annual meeting held in January. There are four categories of membership: full membership, student membership, life membership, and joint membership with sister societies.

Membership

Application and Approval

Membership is by application only, and membership eligibility for both full and student members is defined in Article III of the SCE Bylaws (see Governance Appendix A.1). The application form is available on the website and is submitted to the executive administrator. Applications must be received no later than December 31 for approval at the January meeting of the Board of Directors.

For the January meeting of the Board of Directors the executive administrator prepares a list by name of new applicants who meet the criteria specified in the bylaws. If there are applicants who seem worthy but do not perfectly fit the specified criteria, those applicants are discussed, and membership eligibility is determined on a case-by-case basis. The Board must vote to approve the new members.

The list of new members is then presented to the membership at the annual business meeting where the applicants are received into membership.

Life Membership

Life membership without payment of dues will be granted by the Board of Directors at the January meeting to those who have retired and who have been members in good standing of the Society for at least 25 years. Members meeting these criteria are encouraged to apply for the change in status. In exceptional circumstances, a member having retired, but having fewer than 25 years of membership in good standing in the Society, may be granted life membership by a majority vote of the Board of Directors.

Joint Membership

Members of the Society of Jewish Ethics and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics can join the Society of Christian Ethics either as regular members or as associate members. Members of the Society of Christian Ethics can also elect to be associate members of the Society of Jewish Ethics and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics. Privileges of both regular membership and associate membership are described in the chart below, which was approved by the SCE Board Thursday, January 8, 2015.
## Benefits and Responsibilities of Membership

### Dues

Membership is for a fiscal year, October 1 to September 30, and members pay dues annually, usually at the same time that they register for the annual meeting. Dues are set by the Board of Directors; any changes in dues are announced at the annual business meeting.

### Benefits

Benefits of full membership include:
- A subscription to the *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics (JSCE)*.
- A reduced registration fee for the Annual Meeting.
- Eligibility to submit proposals for concurrent sessions of the annual meeting and therefore eligibility to be published in the *Journal of the Society*.
- Eligibility to submit books of which the member is the sole author, co-author, or editor for discussion at “Breakfast with the Author” at the annual meeting and for review in the *JSCE*.
- Voice and vote at the Annual Business Meeting.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Full Membership in One Society Only</th>
<th>Full Membership in Multiple Societies</th>
<th>Associate Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dues</strong></td>
<td>Pay full dues of relevant society</td>
<td>Full dues of more than one society</td>
<td>Full dues to “primary” society; reduced dues ($60) to “Associate” society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper proposals to SCE</strong></td>
<td>One per year for SCE members only; if accepted, wait out one year</td>
<td>One per year; if accepted, wait out one year (can submit to other society in alternate year)</td>
<td>One per year; if accepted, wait out one year (can submit to other society in alternate year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper Proposals to SJE and SSME</strong></td>
<td>Must be member of relevant society</td>
<td>Must be member of relevant society</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submissions to JSCE</strong></td>
<td>One per year for members of any society, with discretion of Editors</td>
<td>One per year, with discretion of Editors</td>
<td>One per year, with discretion of Editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referee for JSCE</strong></td>
<td>Member of any society</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articles in JSCE</strong></td>
<td>Typically no more than one every other year, with discretion of Editors</td>
<td>Typically no more than one every other year, with discretion of Editors</td>
<td>Typically no more than one every other year, with discretion of Editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSCE Subscription</strong></td>
<td>Included in SCE primary and associate memberships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business meeting participation</strong></td>
<td>Must be member of relevant society to vote; non-voting ex officio attendees from other societies</td>
<td>Full voting business meeting participation in both societies</td>
<td>Only in “primary” society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service/Office</strong></td>
<td>Must be member of relevant society</td>
<td>In both societies</td>
<td>Only in “primary” society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eligibility to be nominated for service on the Board of Directors or as an officer of the Society.

Access to member-protected pages of the Society’s website.

Professional Conduct

Members are subject to the Society’s code of conduct, specified in Bylaws article 3, section 3. Any member who believes another member has violated that code may bring a complaint to the Professional Conduct Committee; for the procedures governing such complaints, see Policy Appendix E.2, “Professional Conduct Policy.”

Membership may be terminated for cause; see Article 3, Section 7 of the bylaws in Governance Appendix A.1.

Membership Renewal and Reinstatement

SCE membership runs from October 1 to September 31 each year (concurrent with the Society’s fiscal year). Membership renews automatically with the payment of dues. Members may pay dues online, by downloading the dues/renewal form from the website, or by including their dues with their registration for the annual meeting.

Members in good standing who have allowed their membership to lapse by nonpayment of dues may reinstate their membership at any time by payment of dues for the current year.

A former member whose membership has been terminated for cause by action of the Board must seek reinstatement by submitting an application for membership.

Communication with Members

Mailings

- Introductory email upon receipt of membership application.
- Emailed receipts for dues payments, registration payments, and donations to the Society.
- Welcome note to new members immediately following annual meeting.
- Call for Proposals.
- Call to Meeting.

Website

The Executive Administrator maintains the website content with the programming assistance of Michael Steigerwald, who is trained in Drupal (website) and Civicrm (database linked to website).

Members can access their own account with a login and password that they can reset. Members can change contact information, pay dues, and register for the annual meeting online.

Any time contact information is changed in the database, it is automatically updated on the website.
The website has multiple layers of viewing. The general public can view general information on the website but cannot view the membership directory. Non-members (publishers' representatives, for example) can create accounts that allow them to log in with some enhanced viewing capabilities. SCE members, once logged in, can view their own information, the membership list, and all public groups (interest groups and caucuses, for example). They can post to the various pages (examples: employment and interest group pages) but not edit them. Only conveners of public groups have the ability to edit those pages. In addition, members who are part of a private SCE group, such as a committee or the Board, are automatically given access to pages used by those private groups and are able to view, post to, and edit those pages as well. The Executive Administrator and the Programmer can see all information except members’ passwords and have the capability to edit all content and structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIEWER</th>
<th>AVAILABLE CONTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>Viewing ability: general content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posting ability: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editing ability: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-members who have created accounts</td>
<td>Viewing ability: most content, group posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posting ability: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editing ability: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members who log in on the site</td>
<td>Viewing ability: All content, group posts, the membership list, the member’s personal account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posting ability: Able to post to groups in which the member participates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editing ability: Only conveners of groups have editing ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members who participate in units that constitute private groups</td>
<td>Viewing ability: All content, including the pages for both public and private groups in which they participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posting ability: Able to post to all groups, public and private, in which they participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editing Ability: Able to edit material on the pages of private groups in which they participate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For policies regarding the usage of the website, and the information found there, see Policy Appendix E.4.

**Pacific Section**

The Pacific Section is a voluntary effort on the part of West Coast members who are willing to organize it. There is no special application process for membership in the Pacific Section.

Meetings of the Pacific Section are not managed by the administrative office and occur only when SCE members on the West Coast voluntarily take the initiative. In recent years the Pacific Section has not met because of the loss (through death or relocation) of the West Coast SCE members who had planned and coordinated meetings at local institutions. Meetings had usually been held the third Friday in February and afforded an opportunity for six or seven scholars to present their work, as well as for the President of the SCE to give an informal presentation of his or her research (the SCE did not subsidize travel for the President to attend Pacific Section meetings when the SCE annual meeting took place on the West Coast). Only SCE members who reside in Washington, California, Oregon and British Columbia received invitations to attend, but the meetings were open to all SCE members. Traditionally the meetings have not been restricted to SCE members. By action of the SCE Board, presenters are not eligible to submit their papers for publication by the *JSCE* because the papers selected for publication must have passed through the SCE Program Committee’s evaluation process and must be refereed.
Donations to the SCE

The SCE has established a variety of means to support international collaboration for SCE members, enable student participation, and pursue efforts to encourage contemporary relevance. Donations are currently accepted for the International Speaker Fund, 21st Century Initiatives, Student Membership Subsidies, Lifetime Achievement Award, or the General Fund. The SCE is a 501 (3c) non-profit corporation; 100 percent of donation amounts are tax deductible.

Lifetime Achievement Award

The Lifetime Achievement Award of the Society of Christian Ethics is given each year to a member, whom the Society wishes to recognize for outstanding, sustained, and substantive contributions that have advanced the field of Christian ethics. The Lifetime Achievement Award Committee takes into consideration the quality and quantity of the member’s publications, the degree to which the member’s scholarship has defined the issues that Christian ethicists must address, the member’s influence within the field of Christian ethics as manifested in the work of the member’s students, and influence of the member’s scholarship in promoting the importance and relevance of Christian ethics for audiences beyond the discipline itself and beyond the academy.

Procedural details:

1. In order to be eligible for the award a person should be or should have been a long-time member of the Society of Christian Ethics.
2. The President shall publicly solicit nominations from the membership at the annual meeting and in the mailing that calls for program proposals. The deadline for submitting nominations is the same as the deadline for program proposals. The Executive Administrator maintains an ongoing file of nominations. After reviewing that file, the Lifetime Achievement Award Committee (whose composition is described below under “Committees of the Society”) will submit the name of its chosen recipient to the Executive Committee at its spring meeting for approval. If the Executive Committee approves the recommendation, the President of the Society contacts the recipient as soon as is feasible. The President also selects a person to compose and read the citation.
3. The award is conferred at a brief ceremony just prior to the presidential address, with the reading of a brief tribute honoring the recipient.
4. The recipient will receive some appropriate object suitable for public display in her or his office or home.
5. The recipient will also receive a waiver for the registration fee and reimbursement for transportation and lodging for the recipient and one guest to attend the annual meeting.
6. The SCE has created a fund for member donations to help provide financial support for the award.

Recipients of the Lifetime Achievement Award

2017 Charles Curran
2016 Margaret Farley
2015 Peter Paris
2014 Daniel Maguire
2013 Beverly W. Harrison
2011 James Gustafson
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4. Governance and Management

Incorporation

The Society of Christian Ethics is incorporated as a 501 (3c) non-profit corporation in the state of Tennessee. For many years the Society’s representative in Tennessee was Charles Reynolds at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville; the Society’s current representative in Tennessee is C. Melissa Snarr at Vanderbilt University.

The officers and Board of Directors of the Society are also the officers and board of the Corporation. The Society’s bylaws require an annual assessment by external auditors in accordance with Tennessee law. Annually the Executive Administrator submits a list of current officers, a one-page summary of the corporation’s financial state that is prepared by the accountant, any changes to the bylaws, and payment of a state fee.

The Society is governed by its Presidential Cabinet and Board of Directors. Between annual meetings, the Society is governed by the Executive Committee of the Board. Day-by-day administration is handled by the Executive Administrator in consultation with the Presidential Cabinet, with special leadership responsibilities falling to the current serving President.

The main function of the Society is its Annual Meeting, whose program is designed by the Program Committee. Intellectual leadership is provided by the President, whose one-year term ends with the transition to a new President (formerly the President Elect) at the annual business meeting. Each year a new Vice President is elected, the former Vice President becomes President Elect, the President Elect rises to the Presidency, and the outgoing President takes the post of Past President.

The Board has three working committees: the Finance and Long-term Planning Committee; the Personnel Committee, and the Technology, Archives, and Inter-Society Relations Committee. In addition to the committees of the Board, the Society has six standing committees (see “Committees of the Society” below).

Ad hoc committees, formed for the purpose of carrying out specific tasks that do not fall within the scope of responsibility of the Committees of the Board or the Committees of the Society, are appointed as needed by the President.
Board of Directors

- The Board of Directors consists of the following voting members: the Vice President, President Elect, President, Past President, Co-Editors of the Journal, and twelve (12) members elected by majority vote of the members present and voting at the Annual Meeting in four classes of three members each, each class serving for four years.
- The Board of Directors includes the following *ex officio* members who have voice but no vote: The Executive Director (currently fulfilled by the Executive Director of Strategic Planning) and Treasurer.²

---

¹ Please also see the Bylaws in Governance Appendix A.1.

² The role of Executive Director (ED) is currently and temporarily fulfilled by the Executive Director of Strategic Planning (EDSP); the document from here on will refer to the EDSP.
● The Executive Administrator attends as needed in an advisory capacity, also *ex officio* and without vote.

● In current practice, the Board of Directors includes two non-voting, advisory student members, each appointed for a two-year term by the President in consultation with Student Caucus leaders.

● Between the Board meetings, which occur at the annual meeting in January, the Society is governed by the Executive Committee of the Board (see “Committees of the Board below).

---

**EXECUTIVE OFFICERS**

**Four-Year Cycle of the Presidential Line**

Election as Vice President commits the office holder to four-year participation in collaborative leadership with the other members of the presidential line (hereafter, “Presidential Cabinet”). Specific duties attached to each year of this service are outlined below.
President: Duties and Powers

Overview

The intellectual leadership exercised by the President involves a number of tasks:

- Compose a Presidential address.
- Propose a theme and designing two plenaries for the Annual Meeting at the end of the Presidential term.
- Appoint, corresponding regularly with, orienting, and acting as host for plenary speakers for the upcoming meeting.
- Chair a minimum of two Board meetings and one Executive Committee/Program Committee meeting during the one-year term; conference call or video-conference Board meetings may be called as needed.
- Serve on the Board’s Finance and Long-term Planning Committee.
- Serve on the International Scholarly Relations Committee.
- In consultation with other members of the Presidential Cabinet, constitute and charge standing committees whose membership changes somewhat annually (see the schedule below).
- Collaborate with the Presidential Cabinet, Executive Director for Strategic Planning, Executive Administrator, Treasurer, and Co-Editors to solve problems that arise but do not require votes.
- Identify needed initiatives and working with the Board to carry them out, whether by ad hoc committee or other means.
- Work with the Executive Administrator, in consultation with the Executive Director of Strategic Planning and the other members of the Presidential Cabinet, to assemble agendas for the Board and Executive Committee meetings.
- Work closely with the Executive Administrator, Executive Director of Strategic Planning, and Presidential Cabinet to ensure that Board mandates are carried out.
- Represent the Society in meetings of constituent (i.e., Pacific Section) or other societies (Society for the Study of Christian Ethics and Societas Ethica, principally). Typically, the SCE assists with travel costs (up to a maximum of $2000 per year).
- Represent the Society to a wider public in response to media queries and other contacts from outside.

Calendar of Activities

First Annual Meeting

- **Saturday**: Accept the role of President at the end of the Business Meeting and announce the speakers and theme for the plenaries at the next annual meeting; participate in the briefing of the newly elected Vice President.
- **Sunday**: Chair the Sunday Board meeting, including orientation of new Board members; appoint each newly elected Board member to one of the Board’s three working committees. Identify the person (usually the Board member in her or his 4th year of service) on each Board committee who will serve as chair for the coming year.

January, shortly after the Annual Meeting

- Draft the Call for Papers letter, identifying theme for next year’s annual meeting.
- Schedule the Executive Committee and the Program Committee meetings for the spring.

February

- If invited, attend Pacific Section meeting.
May give an address (20-30 minutes) or comments about an ongoing project.
Represent the SCE Board on any issues which arise at the Pacific Session meeting.

February-March
- Begin to set agenda with Executive Administrator for spring meeting of the Executive Committee and the Program Committee.
- Remind Board committee chairs to prepare reports for the executive committee meeting.
- Follow up with and solidify plenary speakers and topics.

March-April
- In collaboration with Presidential Cabinet, Executive Administrator, Treasurer, and others, complete agendas for Spring Meeting of Executive/Program Committees.
- Chair both the Executive and Program Committee.

April-July
- Follow up Board agenda items and committee work.
- Contact recipient of the Lifetime Achievement Award and select an appropriate person to prepare and read the citation at the ceremony of conferral.
- Recruit respondents and conveners for plenary addresses, if needed.
- Review the Operations Manual for accuracy; make changes as needed.

August 1
- Draft and submit letter to be included in Call to Meeting mailing.
- Provide details about plenaries (title, speakers, respondents, 100-word abstracts) to Executive Administrator so this information can be included in the program.
- Provide title of Presidential Address to the Executive Administrator.

August-September
- If invited, attend SSCE and/or Societas Ethica. Sometimes the President is invited to present a paper or plenary which may include additional coverage of costs by the society that issues the invitation. Typically an SCE President attends the Societas Ethica meeting only every 3 years; the last year that a President attended this meeting was in 2015 (Bill Schweiker).

September-October
- Consult on details for annual meeting.

November-Early December
- Set Board and Business Meeting agendas in consultation with all relevant officers, committee chairs, and the Executive Administrator.

Second Annual Meeting
- Chair Thursday Board meeting.
- Convene one or both plenaries (optional).
- Give Presidential Address.
- Chair Saturday’s Business meeting until turning gavel over to new President.
- Participate in the briefing of the newly elected Vice President.
Funding of Presidential Travel

Funding for Presidential travel to meetings of the SCE and its committees is explained in the table included in section 5, “Finances and Budgeting.” For other travel, Presidents typically seek funding from their home institutions. When funding is not forthcoming from their home institutions, the SCE offers funding according to the following table, up to a maximum of $2,000 per year, with a limit of $400 on subsidizing travel to the meeting of the Societas Ethica.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pacifc Section</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Lodging</th>
<th>Meals and incidentals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Section</td>
<td>SCE provides</td>
<td>Pacific section arranges; SCE pays.</td>
<td>What Pacific Section does not provide is reimbursed by SCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for the Study of Christian Ethics</td>
<td>SCE provides unless President is a plenary speaker, in which case SSCE provides</td>
<td>SSCE arranges</td>
<td>SSCE arranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societas Ethica if President is invited to deliver a plenary</td>
<td>Societas Ethica provides</td>
<td>Societas Ethica provides</td>
<td>Societas Ethica provides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societas Ethica if President is not giving an address</td>
<td>SCE will contribute up to $400; remainder is the President’s responsibility</td>
<td>Not reimbursed</td>
<td>Not reimbursed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President Elect: Duties and Powers

- Serve on Executive Committee, on the Program Committee, and on the Technology, Archive, and Intersociety Relations Committee of the Board.
- Establish lines of communication and cooperation with the Society of Jewish Ethics and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics so as to enable common endeavors.
- In the summer or early fall, make committee appointments that will take effect after the Saturday business meeting of the upcoming annual meeting:
  - Program Committee. The President Elect appoints an additional member of the Society, not on the Board and usually from the city in which the annual meeting will be held when the President Elect is President. This appointment is for one year only.
  - Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee is entirely new every year. The President Elect appoints the five members of the Nominating Committee, which consists of a chair and four additional members. The chair must be a member of the SCE Board, and the members appointed must commit themselves to attending the upcoming annual meeting at which they will begin receiving nominations and at the subsequent annual meeting at which they will oversee the election process.
  - Review all other committees. In consultation with Presidential Cabinet, appoint replacements for members with completed terms, as needed. See the “Templates for Committees of the Board and the Society” in Governance Appendix A.2.
  - Appoint any search committees that may be needed (JSCE Co-Editors, Treasurer, EDSP, or EA).
• Select theme for the annual meeting at which he or she will deliver the Presidential address, and include that information in the President Elect’s Report at the Annual meeting at which the President Elect becomes President.
• Work with the EDSP and EA to set the dates for the joint spring Executive Committee/and Program Committee meeting that will take place after the annual meeting at which the President Elect becomes President. These committees meet on a Friday and Saturday in the city of the upcoming meeting, if possible.
• In June, review the Operations Manual for accuracy.

At the Annual Meeting at which the President Elect becomes President:
• Thursday Board - announce committee appointments for the next year; identify the theme for the next year’s program, and announce the names of the plenary speakers, if they have been confirmed.
• Friday - introduce the President at the Presidential Address.
• Friday and Saturday: communicate with the Cabinet and Executive Administrator to set Sunday Board Agenda.
• Meet with the Co-Editors and publisher of the *JSCE*.
• Attend the Working Group conveners’ meeting.
• Saturday - at the Business meeting:
  o Announce committee appointments for the next year, especially appointments to the Nominating Committee. Encourage the membership to submit names to the members of the Nominating Committee.
  o At the end of the Business meeting, which is chaired by the incumbent President, the President Elect is announced as the new President. He or she rises to the podium and awards the Presidential pin to the outgoing President while thanking him or her for service. Then he or she adjourns the meeting.
• Arrange and chair the briefing of the newly elected Vice President.

**Vice President: Duties and Powers**

• Immediately after election at the Annual Meeting, the Vice President is included in communications among the members of the Presidential Cabinet and is briefed by the President, President Elect, and Past President about the state of the Society, as well as their respective plans and programmatic efforts.
• The Vice President immediately becomes a member of the Executive Committee and of the Program Committee.
• The Vice President serves as Secretary of the Sunday Board meeting immediately following his or her election and of all Board, Executive, and Program Committee meetings during his or her term as Vice President.
• The Vice President works with the Executive Administrator to make sure the Operations Manual is updated whenever changes occur in SCE policy and practice.
• The Vice President is a member of the Board’s Personnel Committee, but does not chair it.
• For the annual meeting in which he or she becomes President Elect, the Vice President works with Executive Administrator (and Cabinet, if needed) to identify and recruit a Parliamentarian for the Business Meeting, a Secretary to take minutes at the Business Meeting, and four staff members or SCE members to count hands at the business meeting if any matter is settled by a show of hands.
• For the annual meeting in which he or she becomes President Elect, the Vice President works with the Executive Administrator to resolve any member issues that may arise from time to time at that Annual Meeting.
• The Vice President becomes President Elect at the close of the business meeting at the Annual Meeting at the end of his or her one-year term as Vice President.
Past President: Duties and Powers

- The President becomes Past President at the close of the business meeting, when he or she receives the Presidential Pin.
- The Past President participates in briefing the newly elected Vice President.
- The Past President attends the Sunday Board meeting, all Executive and Program Committee meetings, and the Thursday Board meeting at the end of his or her one-year term as Past President.
- The Past President serves on but does not chair the Personnel and Professional Development Committees and serves as Chair of the Lifetime Achievement Award Committee.
- The Past President works with the other members of the Presidential Cabinet, the Board of Directors, and the Executive Administrator to bring his or her initiatives to fruition, and to help implement the initiatives of the current President and President Elect.
- In June, the Past President reviews the Operations Manual to make sure that all changes made during her or his presidency have been incorporated into the Manual.

Executive Director of Strategic Planning: Duties and Powers

The position of Executive Director of Strategic Planning is a temporary position that will run through 2016-2017 (ending June 30, 2017). The position currently serves the Society through close collaboration with the Presidential Cabinet in order to address issues of transition and matters of concern to various constituencies among the members. As a consultative role for the Presidential Cabinet, the position will find ways to forge deeper and more enduring relations among the various facets of the Society in order to envision and execute plans and/or programs strategic to the future life and health of the Society. As with all programmatic implementation, recommendations by the Executive Director of Strategic Planning must be submitted to and approved by the Society’s Board. This is a position that reports to the SCE President. The character and existence of this position will be evaluated by the Board in January 2017.

Treasurer: Duties and Powers

The Treasurer is a stipendiary employee of the Society’s Board of Directors who reports to the Personnel Committee, but is ultimately responsible to the Cabinet and the whole Board.

To ensure smooth transitions when a new Treasurer is appointed, the search should begin early. The 4-year term of the current Treasurer will end with the Thursday Board meeting in 2019. It is desirable that his successor be appointed by the Board in January 2018 so that the incoming Treasurer can shadow the current Treasurer for a year before taking over at the Sunday Board meeting of January 2019.

The Treasurer is responsible for (1) ensuring the Board’s financial directives are carried out; (2) updating the Board on the Society’s financial status; (3) advising the Board on financial options for both its investment and spending priorities; (4) serving on the Board, the Finance and Long-Term Planning Committee and the Executive Committee with voice but no vote; and (5) assisting the work of the officers in carrying out their duties as they relate to the maintenance of the society’s financial resources. Below is a timeline of the Treasurer’s typical workload:

Quarterly:
 Review quarterly the profit and loss statement details issued by the Executive Administrator and alert the Executive Administrator to errors or budget concerns.

January:
 At the annual meeting, participate in both Board meetings and in the annual business meeting to present the financial position of the Society to the Finance Committee, Board, and Society members.
 Ensure that the accountant has filed all tax reports and issued W-2s.

March/April:
 Participate in the Executive Committee meeting.

June/July:
 Assist Executive Administrator with the budget process for the upcoming annual meeting, including the setting of registration fees and calculating potential subventions of costs for certain, annual meeting events.
 Review relevant sections of the Operations Manual.

October:
 Review the balance sheet as of September 30th, and the related statements of revenues, expenses, and changes in fund balance and cash flows for the year then ended, in accordance with standards established by AICPA. As part of the review process, propose new, adjust existing, or otherwise correct journal entries within the financial reports. As a part of this budget planning process, the Treasurer, in consultation with the Finance and Long-Term Planning Committee, should evaluate and, if necessary, propose changes to the membership dues structure, to be approved by the Board.

November:
 Review accountant’s report and be prepared to present the report to the Finance and Long-Term Planning Committee of the Board. (For information about the accountant, see the subsection on the Accountant in the “Term Appointments and Administrative Staff” section below.)

December:
 Prepare annual budget in collaboration with Executive Administrator. Then, present this budget to members of the Finance Committee, members of the Board, and to the society membership. Approve the IRS Form 990 completed by the accountant, currently Cecelia Hamilton, Hamilton Accounting and Tax Service, 530 Main St, Ferdinand IN 47532; email: taxlady@psci.net.

Other Duties:
 Oversee, in consultation with the Board’s Finance and Long-term Planning Committee, the Society’s investment funds, including deciding when to buy and to sell shares of stock and deciding in which funds the Society ought to be investing its money.
 Be available to Executive Administrator as questions arise about the budget and about the QuickBooks system.
 With the Executive Administrator, obtain proposals from future hotels sites, complete site visits, and negotiate hotel contracts for annual meetings.
 Be available to Executive Administrator as questions arise about the budget and about the QuickBooks system.
 Be available to the Finance and Long-Term Planning Committee for consultation.
 Review with the Executive Administrator annually the relationship with the accountant.
Editor(s): Duties and Powers

The Co-Editors serve as full voting members of the Board of Directors and of the Executive Committee of the Board. On the Program Committee, each has .75 vote on paper proposals during the electronic tally (first phase of the selection process), and each has a full vote in the second phase of the selection process.

The Co-Editors are responsible for developing two issues of the *JSCE* each year, maintaining an active Editorial Board, and sharpening the quality of the *JSCE* through regular assessment of publication criteria, reviewer responsibilities, and author eligibility.

Mark Allman and Tobias Winright have followed the division of work established by previous Editors Christine E. Gudorf and Paul Lauritzen. Both Co-Editors review every submission to the *Journal*, attending as many sessions of meeting presentations as possible. In addition, one Editor is responsible for the pre-meeting solicitation of authors to submit their papers for *Journal* review, for the assignment of at least two additional referees to each of the sessions where work is under review, for the collection and tabulation of each review, and for rejection notices along with the provision of anonymous feedback to those so notified. The other Editor is responsible for the post-meeting editing and the production of the manuscripts for Georgetown University Press.

The Co-Editors serve as co-chairs of the *JSCE* Editorial Board, members of which they appoint after consultation with the President and members of the Board of Directors. The Co-Editors also appoint a Book Review Editor to serve during their tenure. The Book Review Editor reports directly to them. For more about the Editorial Board and the Book Review Editor, see the discussion of *JSCE* operations in Section 7, “Media.”

The responsibilities of the Co-Editors are fulfilled by a variety of specific and time-sensitive tasks including:

1. Attend the Annual Meeting of the Society of Christian Ethics.
2. Attend the Thursday and Sunday meetings of the Board of Directors.
3. Report annually to the SCE membership during the annual SCE Business Meeting.
4. Meet annually with the Director of Georgetown University Press, SCE Office staff regarding *Journal* business affairs.
5. Chair the annual meeting of the Editorial Board (at the close of the SCE annual meeting), at which time editorial policies are developed, activities reported, EB members’ feedback regarding press.
6. Both Co-Editors read, score, and write a review of all papers submitted for publication from the Annual Meeting.
7. “Copy” for the spring/summer.1 issue (second set of essays from the previous year’s meeting) received from GUP by the post-meeting/production editor, sent to authors for their editing, and returned to GUP (mid-January to mid-February).
8. Pre-meeting/referee editor collects referee reports, develops files for each author (not referee), and creates an Excel sheet to tally scores.
9. *If the Co-Editors wish to continue the collection of demographic information as a tracking method determining rates of acceptance from proposal through presentation,* the survey must be “live” soon after the “Call for Proposals” is sent to the SCE membership; at present the post-meeting/production editor maintains the survey work.
10. By the end of February, determine which of the papers are accepted for publication by the end of February, usually twenty essays.
11. Notify authors of acceptance or rejection (usually sometime between the middle and the end of March).
a. Post-meeting/production editor: with acceptance, provides authors with referee reports (edited to ensure maintenance of anonymity of the review process and the helpfulness of comments) and instructs authors that their papers must be formatted and edited to meet GUP style guidelines; authors are instructed to return their edited essays to the production editor by May 1 (ordinarily).

b. Pre-meeting/referee editor: with rejection, provides authors with referee reports (edited to ensure maintenance of anonymity of the review process and the helpfulness of comments) and encouragement to develop their work and submit it elsewhere; this editor responds to queries about rejections as helpfully as possible.

12. Both Editors read, review, and score all proposals submitted to the “Call for Proposals” to the next year’s Annual Meeting of the SCE (two-week turnaround from receipt to rating in March); the Editors are to be especially mindful of proposals that suggest research with human subjects and which therefore might require IRB compliance in order to “flag” those proposals for follow-up by the SCE staff.

13. “Proofs” for the spring/summer .1 issue received from GUP by the post-meeting/production editor, sent to authors for their final (limited) review, and returned to GUP (mid-March to mid-April).

14. Attendance at the spring meeting of the SCE Program Committee and Executive Committee meetings (March or April).

15. The post-meeting/production editor prepares the manuscript for the first issue from this round of accepted papers – the fall/winter .2 issue of the volume year (May 15-30, hard copy mail out to GUP); since the production editor determines the order/issue in which essays are published, this editor ordinarily writes the first draft of the Preface for the issue; additionally, if the Co-Editors have continued the collection of demographic information, the post-meeting/production editor aggregates the data and creates a chart for inclusion with the preface to this issue.

16. The Book Review Editor receives books, assigns reviewers, and collects reviews throughout the year; edited formatted reviews are sent to the post-meeting/production editor by May 15 and September 15.

17. Both Editors conduct Editorial Board business over the summer months.
   a. Send thank you notes to retiring members of the Editorial Board.
   b. In consultation with the President (and any members of the Board of Directors s/he wishes to consult), invite eligible SCE members to join the Editorial Board based on the need for their expertise, interest and availability to so serve, and SJE and SSME members to serve as representatives from their respective societies and their societies’ interests and expertise to the Editorial Board.
   c. Address, in consultation with the Editorial Board, policy matters relevant to the Journal.
   d. Update website FAQs as necessary; develop other journal related website materials.
   e. Monitor JSCE and ATLA/MUSE relationships in consultation with SCE Office staff.

18. “Copy” for the fall/winter .2 issue (first set of essays from the January meeting) received from GUP by the post-meeting/production Editor, sent to authors for their editing, and returned to GUP (mid-July to mid-August)

19. The pre-meeting/referee Editor asks the SCE Office staff to (re)invite authors to consider submitting their papers to the JSCE for publication review (August/September).

20. “Proofs” for the fall/winter .2 issue received from GUP by the post-meeting/production Editor, sent to authors for their final (limited) review, and returned to GUP (mid-September to mid-October).

21. The post-meeting/production editor prepares the manuscript for the second issue from this round of accepted papers as what will be the spring/summer .1 issue of the next volume.
year (October 1 hard copy mail out to GUP); again, since the production Editor determines the order in which essays are published, this Editor ordinarily writes the first draft of the Preface for the issue.

22. The pre-meeting/referee Editor solicits and assigns referees, two for each paper session, based on their expertise, interests and availability and willingness to attend the session at which the submission is presented. At the same time these assignments are made, referees are provided with electronic copies of the JSCE Publication Criteria, Score Sheet, and Referee Responsibility statements. This process takes place between October and mid-December. Editorial Board members usually review two or three papers at the Annual Meeting; referees drawn from those with full membership in the SCE at large normally review no more than one paper per meeting.

23. Prepare a JSCE report (financial and otherwise) to be submitted to the SCE Office for inclusion on the agenda of the annual Thursday meeting of the Board of Directors (November 30).

For discussion of the Editorial Board, the Book Review Editor, and the operations pertinent to publication, see the discussion of the JSCE in Section 7, “Media,” as well as the JSCE Appendix C.1 and JSCE Appendix C.2.

Transitions between Editors
To ensure a smooth transition when new Co-Editors are appointed, and taking into account that the full Board only meets in January, the search for new Co-Editors must begin early enough to allow for a good deal of overlap between the incoming and departing Editors. The timetable for the transition 2016-2017 looks like this:

October, 2016:
- New Co-Editor shadows Tobias Winright through matching of referees with papers and their instruction regarding process.

January, 2017:
- Current and new Co-Editors read/score all submissions.
- Current Co-Editors attend the Thursday Board meeting, while the new Co-Editors attend the Sunday Board meeting.
- Both the outgoing Co-Editors and the new Co-Editors attend the Sunday Editorial Board meeting, with the outgoing Co-Editors chairing the meeting initially and then transferring that responsibility during the meeting to the new Co-Editors.

Spring 2017:
- Outgoing Co-Editors write preface for issue 37.1 (remaining essays from 2016 Toronto meeting).
- New Co-Editors write preface for issue 37.2 (first issue from the 2017 meeting).
- New Co-Editor shadows Mark Allman regarding production.
- New Co-Editors read and score program proposals for 2018 and attend spring Executive and Program Committee meetings.
COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD

See also the committee template in Governance Appendix A.2.

Executive Committee

The executive committee consists of the following voting members: the Vice President, President Elect, President, Past President, the JSCE Co-Editors, and the three chairs of the Board’s working committees. The committee includes the Executive Director for Strategic Planning and the Treasurer ex officio with voice but no vote. The Executive Administrator attends in an advisory capacity as needed. This committee typically meets in March or April to carry out Society business between the January Board meetings. Whenever possible this meeting takes place at the site of the upcoming annual meeting.

Finance and Long-term Planning Committee

The Finance and Long-term Planning Committee consists of the President, the Treasurer, the Executive Administrator, and four Board members, one from each class of the Board. After the election at the annual business meeting, the President appoints one of the three newly elected Board members to serve on this committee for the coming four years. The President appoints the chair of the committee, usually the senior member of the committee. This committee prepares the annual budget, makes budget forecasts, and oversees the finances of the Society. It reports annually to the Board.

Personnel Committee

The Personnel Committee consists of the Vice President, the Past President, and four Board members, one from each class of the Board. After the election at the annual business meeting, the President appoints one of the three newly elected Board members to serve on this committee for the coming four years. The President appoints the chair of the committee, usually the senior member of the committee. This committee oversees and assesses all contractual employee relations as well as the performance of the Treasurer, Executive Administrator, and the Executive Director of Strategic Planning. It reports annually to the Board.

Technology, Archives, and Inter-Society Relations Committee

The Technology and Inter-Society Relations Committee consists of the President Elect, the Executive Administrator, and four Board members, one from each class of the Board. After the election at the annual business meeting, the President appoints one of the three newly elected Board members to serve on this committee for the coming four years. The President appoints the chair of the committee, usually the senior member of the committee. In collaboration with the Society’s staff, this committee assesses and oversees the technological needs of the society and facilitates relations with the SCE’s sister societies. It also serves as the Society’s archivist. It reports annually to the Board.
COMMITTEES OF THE SOCIETY

See also the committee template in Governance Appendix A.2.

International Scholarly Relations Committee

The International Scholarly Relations Committee (formerly the Global Research in Ethics Committee created in 2010) has the general charge of developing ties with scholars and institutions throughout the world. It consists of the President and six other members, four drawn from the SCE and one each from its sister societies, SJE and SSME. One of the SCE members serves as Chair and another as Vice Chair. Members serve four-year terms. After the January meeting, the President appoints replacements for outgoing members in consultation with the remaining committee members. Ex officio members are invited to serve as needed. Currently and in the recent past, this committee has also overseen proposals for international scholarly visits to the SCE and to its members’ institutions.

Lifetime Achievement Award Committee

The Lifetime Achievement Award Committee consists of the three outgoing Board members and the Past President. The criteria for the Award and the selection process are described on p. 9 above.

Nominating Committee

The Nominating Committee is appointed annually by the President Elect and is entirely new each year, with members serving for one year only. It consists of five members: a chair (a member of the Board of Directors) and four other members of the Society who are not members of the Board. Committee members are appointed in advance of the meeting at which they will begin their work and must be available to attend both the meeting at which they begin gathering information about potential nominees and at the meeting at which they present the slate and oversee the election. This committee nominates a slate of two candidates for Vice President and six candidates for three Board positions. At the annual meeting at which their slate is presented, committee members distribute, collect, and count the ballots. The committee chair announces the election results at the Saturday business meeting. For procedures, see Governance Appendix A.3.

Professional Conduct Committee

Consisting of six senior and respected members of the Society, members of the Professional Conduct Committee are appointed by the President to terms of three years on a rolling basis. The chair of the committee, typically one of its senior members, is appointed each year by the President. The PCC meets only as needed, during the Annual Meeting, to respond to allegations of misconduct according to an informal grievance procedure defined in the Standards of Professional Conduct adopted by the SCE in 2009. It reports annually to the membership in the business meeting.
Professional Development Committee

The Professional Development Committee was established in 2015 in response to the 2020 committee and primarily to address the growing ethical and professional concerns related to recent marked institutional changes affecting academic appointments: most notably, the reduction of tenure-line positions, increases in the number of faculty working on contracts, and the rising use (and abuse) of part-time contingent/adjunct faculty. It is an ad hoc committee.

Program Committee

The Program Committee meets conjointly with the Executive Committee, normally in March or April. It consists of the Vice President, President Elect, President, Past President, and three members of the Board who chair the Board’s three working committees, and one additional SCE member (usually residing in the vicinity of the upcoming Annual Meeting), appointed by the President. By custom, the JSCE Co-Editors are also members of the committee. The Executive Director of Strategic Planning and the Executive Administrator are ex officio members, with voice but no vote.

The Program Committee selects the papers to be delivered in concurrent sessions and designs the program for the Annual Meeting. The process by which papers are selected has two phases. After the deadline for proposals and before the spring Program Committee meeting, there is a blind numerical evaluation of all proposals by a relatively large group that includes the Program Committee members but also representatives of various constituencies within the Society. The compilation of the numerical scores determines 75 percent of the program. The Executive Administrator compiles the scores and provides a list of the accepted papers when the Program Committee meets face-to-face. The Program Committee then determines the remaining 25 percent of the program, taking into account demographic information, underserved areas of interest, and other pertinent contingencies.

The persons who have votes in the two phases of the selection process, and the weight of the votes of various readers at the two stages of the process, have been carefully determined after considerable deliberation by and action of the Board of Directors. The weighting is designed to assure that elected members of the Society hold a minimum of 60 percent of the decision-making authority in the first stage of the process and 70 percent of the decision-making authority in the second stage. For the official table specifying the voting weights of the members of the Program Committee, see Governance Appendix A.4.

Search Committee(s)

The Search Committee(s), appointed by the President as needed and normally chaired by Board members, identify and vet candidates for term appointments within the Society. A Presidential Search Committee is also required to replace the Executive Administrator if the serving Executive Administrative gives notice of intention to leave the position. Search committees are often appointed twelve to sixteen months before a position must be filled so that the committee’s

---

3 The revised bylaws, which will come before the membership for approval in January 2017, specify that the Co-Editors are members of the Program Committee. Current bylaws do not so specify, though this has been customary practice for some years.
recommendations can be considered and acted upon at a face-to-face meeting of the Board and to allow for overlap and transition.

**Term Appointments and Administrative Staff**

**SCE Members Appointed by the Board to SCE Offices for Specific Terms**

The Board of Directors appoints members, customarily after a search process, to fill certain positions for a specified period. Descriptions of these positions are provided in the section on Executive Officers above. Currently the term appointments are:

**Executive Director:** (Currently Executive Director for Strategic Planning)
Stacey Floyd-Thomas (July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2017)

**Treasurer:** Four-year term
Patrick Flanagan (January 2015 to January 2019)

**Co-Editors of the *JSCE***:
Mark Allman and Tobias Winright (January 2012-January 2017)
Kevin Carnahan and Scott Paeth (January 2017-January 2022)

The Personnel Committee of the Board is responsible for an annual review of the performance of these term appointees.

The members of the *JSCE* Editorial Board are appointed by the Co-Editors in consultation with the President and the Board. The Book Review Editor is appointed by the Co-Editors. Holders of these offices report to the Co-Editors and are not reviewed by the Personnel Committee.

**Administrative Staff**

The administrative staff of the Society at present consists of the full-time Executive Administrator, an accountant and a website programmer who work part-time, and such occasional staff assistants as the Executive Administrator may make arrangements with to provide support in the preparation for and management of the annual meeting.

**Executive Administrator: Duties and Powers**

The Executive Administrator is a contract employee of the Society, who is ultimately responsible to the Board and the Presidential Cabinet but reports to the Personnel Committee of the Board. Each year the Personnel Committee conducts a performance review of the Executive Administrator.

The Executive Administrator bears all responsibilities for the administrative operation of the Society. The position will interface with the Board, the various Presidential offices (Vice President, President Elect, President, Past President), the Society’s Treasurer, the Co-Editors of the *Journal*, the website programmer, the accountant, and the Society’s members. Contracts with any independent support services deemed necessary by the Board will be worked out in consultation with the Executive Administrator, who will also oversee the SCE’s operational relationship with those services.

Some of the most important responsibilities of the Executive Administrator are:
Annually submitting the required corporation filings with the State of Tennessee.
Annually checking with the treasurer to make sure that tax reports have been filed by the accountant with the IRS and any state that may require such filing.
Coordinating the planning and execution of the Annual Meeting.
Serving as the day-to-day book keeper of the finance records.
Supporting and interacting with the Cabinet, Co-Editors, Board members, and committee chairs.
Responding to questions and concerns of SCE members.
Maintaining the website.
Making a detailed sheet for the Calls for Proposals/Meetings.
Gathering reports from working groups, caucuses, and committees in preparation for Board meetings.
Maintaining and updating the Operations Manual as needed.
Making sure all positions have their job descriptions, and referring all officers to policy page on website.
Coordinating the marketing opportunities with publishers for the Journal and Annual Meeting.

For a more detailed month by month list of tasks, see Management Appendix B.1, but also Management Appendix B.2.

Accountant

The Treasurer and the Executive Administrator select the Accountant who will review the financial records annually and prepare a report for the Board. The Accountant files all tax reports after the Treasurer reviews the information. The Executive Administrator furnishes information to the Accountant in a timely way in order that the W-2 be issued by the Accountant in time to meet the filing deadline. Cecelia Hamilton is the current Accountant, since Fall 2010.

Website Programmer

The Website Programmer is selected by the Executive Administrator in consultation with the Board’s Technology, Archives, and Inter-Society Relations Committee. The Programmer is responsible for web design and function of the website while the Executive Administrator enters all content. The current website is using Drupal and Civicrm programs. Michael Steigerwald is the current Programmer, since 2011.

Occasional Staff Assistants

The Executive Administrator customarily makes arrangements with 5 or 6 support personnel who assist in the preparation and transport of materials for the annual meeting. These assistants travel to the annual meeting to assist there with the distribution of materials, processing walk-in registrations, preparing materials needed for the Board meetings and the annual Business Meeting, providing for use of SCE owned projectors, collecting tickets at meal events, performing head counts at all sessions (which helps the following year in room assignments), collecting papers submitted for the JSCE and distributing copies to assigned referees, resolving issues with attendees and the hotel (such as meeting room temperature), printing presentation for plenary speakers, etc.. In 2016 these assistants received a stipend of between $300 and $500 each. In 2017 the amount of the stipends will increase to $900 each.
5. Finances and Budgeting

Audits

The accountant (see above) performs annually a review of the Society finances and submits summaries to the Board for the January meeting.

Sources of Income

The Society relies on the following sources of income to function:

- Dues.
- Member registration fees for the Annual Meeting.
- Annual Meeting: exhibitors, sponsors, nonmember registrations.
- Investments.
- Ads in the Journal and in the Annual Meeting program book.
- Royalties including copyright permissions.
- Sale of mailing lists.
- Donations: General, International Speaker Fund, 21st Century Initiatives (primarily working groups), Student Membership Subsidy (donations used to subsidize meal costs), and Lifetime Achievement Award.

At its annual meeting each January, the Board will review, discuss, and vote on any changes to subsidies of registration fees and costs of meals that are proposed by the Board’s Finance and Long-Term Planning Committee and the Treasurer.

Fixed Expenditures

Principal expenditures include:

- All of the costs associated with the Annual Meeting.
- Salaries, payments, and stipends for individuals who carry out the work of the SCE.
- Travel costs associated with the governance of the SCE.
- Publication of the JSCE.

From time to time, SCE receives requests for financial support for any number of interests, projects, or needs. Each request is currently handled on an ad hoc basis by the Board, which considers and votes on them. All requests must be in writing and presented no later than December 1. Decisions rendered are final, but do not preclude future requests.

The Board has committed the Society to funding working groups established by the 21st Century Initiatives. Each group is given an amount each year (currently $3,000) to use as they wish. Funds have been used for speakers, for student coordinators, and for meals for group members during the annual meeting. Not included in these allocated funds are the loss of revenue through the current use of waivers for students of color (in the past students involved in the Jewish working group and the Muslim ethics working group were also beneficiaries of such waivers). Students who agree to participate in the working groups are granted waivers to cover dues and registration. More information on waivers can be found in the Annual Meeting section below.
The Annual Meeting

For a detailed chart of Annual Meeting Expenses and Spring Meeting Expenses, see Management Appendix B.3.

Budgeting Process

In 2016, the Presidential Cabinet concluded that SCE lacked an adequate budgeting process. That process is now under development.

6. The Annual Meeting

The Annual Meeting is held each January, usually the first weekend after the New Year’s holiday, and provides members the opportunity to present and discuss scholarly papers, review published works in the field, and conduct official business. Between 70 and 75 plenaries, papers, and panels are presented over three days. The SCE meets in conjunction with the Society of Jewish Ethics and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics. Members, including ABD student members, are invited to submit proposals for papers each spring; the proposals are usually due in early March. The Society’s program committee evaluates the proposals and selects papers for delivery at the meeting. The decisions of the Program Committee are final. Papers of those authors interested in publication are peer reviewed by other members of the Society, and papers recommended by the referees appear as articles in the Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics.

Joint Meeting with Sister Societies

The Society of Jewish Ethics (SJE) and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics (SSME) meet jointly with the Society of Christian Ethics. All sessions of the three societies are open to all attendees to provide for opportunities for enriching dialogue.

Each society distributes to its members its own call for proposals, selects and accepts proposals for its own program, and issues its own call to meeting. Each society designates its own conveners for sessions. Papers from all three societies are eligible for consideration by the JSCE, but the SJE and SSME independently identify referees for those papers on their own program that authors intend to submit to the JSCE for consideration. The names of the referees are communicated to the Executive Administrator and the Co-Editors by mid-December.

Two of the three plenaries at the Annual Meeting are planned by the President of the SCE; the SJE and SSME alternate planning and subsidizing the costs of the Annual Meeting’s third plenary. The SCE Program Committee determines the scheduling of all three plenary sessions.

SCE selects the hotels and carries the contract but allows for meeting spaces and guest rooms for attendees of all three societies. SCE establishes the overall program schedule and registration costs which the Executive Administrator communicates in a timely way to the leadership of the other two societies. The Executive Administrator assigns all meeting spaces to avoid conflicts. SJE and SSME may use the SCE’s LCD projectors if they are available.

Each society handles its own pre-registrations and communicates the number of registrations to the Executive Administrator before December 15th so registration packets and name badges can be assembled. Late registrations are communicated to the Executive Administrator as they are received. Members make their registration payments to their respective society, except credit card
payments onsite, which are processed through SCE. Following the meeting the Executive Administrator calculates the cost of the meeting per person for SJE and SSME, excluding SCE-only expenses (Board meetings, business meeting, and Presidential Reception are excluded for SJE [whose members do not attend the reception]; Board meetings and business meeting for the SSME [whose members do attend the Presidential Reception]) and meal costs. Since SCE subsidizes the registration and meal costs, and since SJE and SSME charge the same registration costs and meal costs as the SCE, the full costs of registration and meals are used in calculating monies owed because the SJE and the SSME must also subsidize the cost of their members’ registration and meals. Any registrations waived by SJE and SSME are not charged.

In order to ease the use of stairs for Orthodox Jews during Shabbat, the Executive Administrator communicates to the hotel all names of SJE attendees and requests that they be housed on the lowest guest room floor unless individuals request otherwise. Kosher meals are planned and coordinated by SJE.

**Annual Business Meeting**

The annual business meeting, open to all members of the SCE, is held on Saturday of the Annual Meeting. Any motions regarding changes to the bylaws must be communicated to the membership in the Call to Meeting. The Vice President appoints a Parliamentarian and a Secretary for the minutes. A quorum for conducting business at the Annual Meeting consists of a number of members equal to ten percent (10%) of the membership in the Society at the time of the Annual Meeting (see Bylaws, Governance Appendix A.1). The meeting consists of approving the past year’s minutes; reports from the President/Board, the Executive Director of Strategic Planning, the Treasurer, and the Editor(s); election of officers; memorializing those members who have died in the past year; and any other business necessary.

**SCE Concurrent Sessions**

Concurrent Sessions, paper and panel presentations that are held at the same time, are the core of the Annual Meeting. Usually, there are up to seven (7) 90-minute session slots during which up to twelve (12) sessions are offered simultaneously. These presentations are scheduled in such a way as to ensure that diverse subjects are represented in every set of concurrent sessions. Most presentation methods consist of a single paper presentation, a paper with respondent, or a panel with or without respondent. In each case, time is allotted for introduction of presenters and significant discussion, facilitated by a session convener assigned by the Executive Administrator from a pool of willing volunteers. Prior to the meeting both presenters and conveners are provided with sheets specifying their responsibilities—for the text of these documents, see Annual Meeting Appendix D.1.

Currently SCE owns three LCD projectors. When individuals submit proposals, they are asked to indicate whether they wish to use this equipment. The Program Committee then assigns papers in concurrent sessions so that no more than 3 are using projectors in any set of concurrent sessions. The Executive Administrator assigns these sessions to the same three rooms throughout the conference so cost for screens and electricity is minimized. Presenters who need internet access are responsible for the associated cost and for arrangements with the hotel. Presenters using a LCD projector are asked to sign the contract (see Annual Meeting Appendix D.3) that clarifies what is provided.

**Plenaries**

Plenaries are the three 90-minute general sessions wherein all the conferees from all three sister societies are encouraged to assemble together for an exploration of important issues in ethics.
Two of the plenaries (one held on Friday and the other on Saturday) offer speakers or panels chosen by the SCE President to develop the thematic focus the President has identified for that year. These plenary speakers invited and hosted by the President, may be but do not have to be members of the Society. The hour and a half session is meant to include time for introducing the plenary speaker, the presentation (which should be no more than 45 or 50 minutes), and for discussion, which is facilitated by the President or by a convener chosen by the President. The session may include but does not have to include a formal response by an SCE member.

The third plenary held on Sunday, or at another time set by the Program Committee, is planned and offered by SJE and SSME in alternating years.

**Waivers**

In the fall as soon as registration for the Annual Meeting opens, the Executive Administrator emails all student members who may be eligible to apply for waivers. Students participating in the Working Groups may apply to have both their annual dues and registration for the Annual Meeting waived. A student may apply for waivers only four times and at the time of application must both have graduate student status and be an active participant in one of the three Working Groups. Students with waivers enjoy all the same privileges as paying student members. However, eligibility is subject to several conditions.

**Regarding dues waivers for Working Group student members**

Waivers for dues are granted only if the student is attending the annual meeting and participates in the Working Group.

- The waiver expires each year, and so must be applied for annually.
- This application (Annual Meeting Appendix D.5) must be received by December 1st, whether by mail or email (sce@scethics.org).
- In this email, the student must state that he/she continues to be a student, identify the institution, and state that he/she is not employed full time. All email requests will be acknowledged.
- Waivers for dues can be renewed only if the student attends at least every other Annual Meeting after receiving the first waiver.
- Waivers for dues expire when the student completes the dissertation or is hired for full-time teaching, whichever comes first. At that point, the student transfers into full membership.

**Regarding meeting registration waivers for Working Group student members**

- Waivers for meeting registrations cover only the early bird rate; if registration is received after the December 1 deadline, the student must pay the supplement for regular registration.
- This waiver also must be applied for each year.
- Waivers for meeting registrations are no longer available once the student graduates, completes the dissertation, or is hired for full-time teaching. At that point, the student transfers into full membership.
- Requests for waivers will not be considered during or after the meeting.
- A student who is new to SCE must complete the membership application form and submit it by December 1 in order to be eligible for a meeting registration waiver.
At the Annual Meeting, the Executive Administrator provides to the conveners of the Working Groups a list of those students who have received the waiver. Working Groups are responsible for indicating to the Executive Administrator whether or not the students participated in the group. Participation information should be provided before the end of the Annual Meeting and certainly no later than January 30.

**Submitting Proposals for Papers, Panels, and Breakfast with an Author Discussions**

**Submitting Proposals**

Members in good standing, that is, whose dues are current, may propose a paper or panel. All member participants involved in panels must also be in good standing. Student members, as sole presenters, may submit paper proposals for concurrent sessions only if they have successfully completed qualifying exams before the deadline for submission of proposals.

The Program committee accepts proposals for paper or panel presentations from individual members (singly or jointly), and from Working Groups and Interest Groups. Members may only present papers or serve on panels in concurrent sessions every other year. However, members who presented papers or served on panels in evening meetings of Interest Groups or in pre-conferences sessions are eligible to submit proposals for concurrent sessions the subsequent year.

1. The call for proposals is distributed by email to all members (or by postal mail if requested) within the two weeks following the Annual Meeting.
2. The submission deadline, usually mid to late March, is set annually by the Executive Administrator, working backwards from the date of the spring Program Committee meeting.
3. Proposals must be submitted on the appropriate forms, which can be found in the Call for Proposals packet or on the SCE website at [www.scethics.org](http://www.scethics.org). Proposals must fall within the specified word limitations.
4. Proposals must be submitted via the website or by email attachment to the Executive Administrator’s Office. Members without access to email may make arrangements to submit by postal mail or fax.
5. Forms received after the deadline will normally not be considered for the program.
6. Receipt of proposals will be confirmed by email only. Those who do not supply an email address or are without email access are responsible for contacting the Executive Administrator’s Office if they wish to confirm receipt of the proposal.
7. Proposals for research or interviews with human subjects must have approval from an Institutional Review Board (see [JSCE Appendix C.2](http://jsce.org/1528) or "Publication Criteria and IRB Regulations" on the [JSCE tab of the webpage](http://jsce.org/1528))
8. See below for more on who may submit proposals.

**Criteria by Which Proposals Are Evaluated**

Proposals for concurrent sessions compete for program slots; to allow adequate time for discussion, only one paper is permitted in each concurrent session (unless a panel is proposed). Proposals are first evaluated in a blind review in which the readers receive only the title, abstract, and reference list. In the second phase of consideration demographic and other factors come into play.
1. For papers: *academic quality*—detail and coherence of the argument; clearly articulated methodology; scholarly promise and significance, and manageability of the topic within a 20-25 page paper.
2. For panels: *academic quality*—coherence of the presentations; scholarly promise and significance; manageability of the topic as it relates to number of panelists.
3. *Originality.*
5. *Interest to the Society and relevance to the announced theme of the meeting.*
6. In selecting among proposals in the second phase of the selection process, the Program Committee will be sensitive to the SCE’s commitment to gender, ethnic and denominational diversity.
7. In general, proposals dedicated to reporting on books that are in print before the Annual Meeting will not be accepted—particularly when the proposed session involves presentations by the authors or editors of the book in question.

Only the names of actual proposers can appear in the program. Additional names may be added only with the approval of the Program Committee.

**The Process by Which Proposals Are Selected for the Program**

The Program Committee considers all proposals for concurrent sessions that are submitted by the deadline. The selection occurs in two phases. In Phase 1, which usually occurs three weeks before the spring meeting of the Program Committee, all proposals are sent electronically (or in print if so requested) to all members of the Program Committee as well as representatives of a number of prominent constituencies within the Society (see the Governance Appendix A.4, the description of the Program Committee above, and the Bylaws in Governance Appendix A.1). All those who receive the proposals rate them on a 1 to 5 scale on a score sheet listing all submissions received by the due date. To avoid disadvantaging proposals in the second half of the list, which might otherwise become victims of reader fatigue, all committee members are assigned different points in the list at which to begin.

The score sheets are returned to the Executive Administrator who compiles the total score for each proposal. The Executive Administrator calculates 75 percent of the likely number of available concurrent sessions and fills that number of concurrent sessions beginning with the proposal receiving the highest total score and accepting proposals in descending order until 75 percent of the total available concurrent sessions have been filled. This information is then provided to the Program Committee when it meets face-to-face, usually in April.

At the Program Committee meeting, the remaining sessions (25 percent of the program) are filled after further deliberation about the proposals. At this point, the Program Committee considers such things as the range of subject matter (to make sure that the program will address as many of the diverse interests of the membership as possible in a balanced program); the need for gender, ethnic, and denomination diversity; the desirability of including proposals that deal with emerging problems or issues that deserve renewed attention.

**Exceptions to the Selection Process**

There are some concurrent sessions reserved for special purposes and are not subject to the normal competitive process:

- Working Groups are each guaranteed one concurrent session, and may propose a panel or paper for a further concurrent session, competing with other proposals.
For the 2017 meeting, the Program Committee voted to reserve two concurrent sessions in addition to the Plenary to allow the President to invite senior members of the Society to offer papers.

For the 2017 meeting, two concurrent sessions have been reserved for International Scholars who had been proposed to and approved by the International Scholarly Relations Committee [Note that this is a policy that is currently being reviewed].

Interest Groups are permitted to compete for concurrent session slots, but no concurrent sessions are reserved for their use (see the discussion of Interest Groups below). A maximum of two slots in any given set of concurrent sessions will be allocated to Interest Groups and Working Groups, with Working Groups given priority.

**Arranging for a Book to be Discussed at Breakfast with an Author**

The Book Review Editor welcomes guests to the two Breakfast with an Author sessions. Authors are present to discuss their recent publications at a table of members who indicate an interest in reading and talking about the book. Each table also includes a convener.

To protect the SCE financially from undersubscribed tables, the number of tables at the Breakfast with an Author session will be limited. If preregistration shows that some tables are too undersubscribed to be financially feasible, the member or members who did indicate interest will be redistributed among other tables; these relocated participants will be given a choice of which other table to join.

1. Authors or editors are encouraged to propose their own books for discussion.
2. Authors or editors must be members in good standing.
3. The book must have some relationship with the interests of the SCE membership.
4. Books to be discussed at the Annual Meeting must have been published no earlier than January 1 two years previous to the meeting, and by May 1 in the year before the meeting transpires.
5. Books are accepted into the Breakfast on a first come, first served basis, but must be submitted by the proposal deadline.
6. Authors of two books may propose both, knowing that the discussions will be on separate days and that the author will need to purchase breakfast for both days.
7. All participants, including authors, must sign up and purchase tickets to attend.
8. Revised editions that have been previously included in the Breakfast with an Author will not be accepted.

Directions for authors and facilitators during the Breakfast with an Author can be found in Annual Meeting Appendix D.4.

**Members’ Collaborative Groups**

The SCE encourages members to gather in pursuit of common interests. Historically, it has sponsored three types of groups:

- **Interest groups** arise in response to topical interests and usually exist only for as long as the members sustain their common endeavor. Interest Groups typically meet on Friday and Saturday evenings, and the number of groups is limited only by the evening meeting space available in conference venues. They normally receive no funding.
• **Working groups** have served several purposes over the Society’s history. Currently, their mission is to enhance the visibility and contribution of emerging constituencies within Christian ethics: African and African-American Christian ethics; Latino/a Christian ethics; and Asian and Asian-American Christian ethics. Each working group receives an annual pledge of funds from the Board (currently $3000) to carry out its work.

• **Caucuses** arise in response to common professional concerns of a constituency. Caucuses typically hold lunch meetings during the conference and sometimes request funding or fee waivers from the Board. Financial support is not guaranteed.

### SCE Interest Groups

Interest Groups exist to provide a time and location for scholars to interact in ways of their own choosing with respect to topics that are of particular continuing interest to identifiable clusters of members. See [Annual Meeting Appendix D.2](#) for a list and description of all current Interest Groups; see [https://scethics.org/history-annual-meetings-programs-themes-sites-and-groups](https://scethics.org/history-annual-meetings-programs-themes-sites-and-groups) for a comprehensive chart of all interest groups, past and current.

Interest Groups are formed by submitting a letter to the Program Committee that outlines the purpose of the IG, provides brief background, indicate how it differs from existing related groups, lists the founding members and other members who have expressed support, and identifies one or two conveners. This can be done online at [https://scethics.org/forms/propose-new-group](https://scethics.org/forms/propose-new-group). To secure an evening slot at the next annual meeting, the letter of application must be submitted by the proposal deadline.

Interest Groups typically meet at every Annual Meeting and exist only as long as (1) that focus continues to draw participants and (2) voluntary conveners continue to plan sessions. Groups typically meet during the Annual Meeting on either Friday or Saturday night beginning at 8 p.m. There is no limit on the number of Interest Groups, except the meeting space available in the convention hotel. Groups select their own leadership and determine their own meeting format and content. At least one of a SCE interest group’s conveners must be a member of the SCE. Each interest group has a page on the website to continue discussion or to post papers, etc.

To encourage the formation of interest groups, the Society guarantees an evening slot to each group that maintains a program from year to year. Each year at the time that program proposals are due, Interest Group conveners must submit proposals for the next meeting, identifying a topic, relevant resources and the means of presentation. These proposals are not subject to the competitive evaluation by the Program Committee. Rather, all interest group proposals are accepted, subject to the number of meeting rooms available. Presenters at evening sessions do not need to be members; if a Group invites a non-member to speak, the non-member’s registration fee is waived. Any such Interest Group guests must pay their own transportation and lodging expenses.

After each annual meeting, usually at the time a proposal is submitted for the following year, conveners submit a brief report indicating what programming occurred and what decisions, if any, were made concerning the leadership of the Group. Groups that do not intend to meet at the upcoming meeting must make that known to the Executive Administrator as early as possible because it has implications for negotiations for hotel space. Groups that have not met for two consecutive years assume inactive status, will no longer be listed in the program or have a web page, and will have to reapply should interest be renewed.
Groups from time to time may wish to offer a day-time concurrent session. In this case, they must compose a full proposal using the form for proposals for concurrent sessions and submit the proposal as the form directs and before the proposal submission deadline. Interest Groups are given no special privilege, and their proposals will be judged competitively with all other proposals submitted. Proposals for concurrent sessions must meet concurrent session criteria regarding eligibility of presenters. If the proposal of the Interest Group is accepted for a concurrent session, the paper presented there is eligible for consideration by the JSCE. If a Group’s proposal is not accepted for a concurrent session, the Group may request and evening Interest Group meeting time for the planned presentation(s).

**SCE Working Groups**

Working groups represent and seek to build constituencies that are under-represented within the Society and in the field of ethics. Working group sessions are an opportunity for the group to mentor student members and young scholars and to hold a business meeting for the group. Funding is available to working groups as well as waivers for students attending, covering their registration and dues (see the discussion of waivers above). Our sister societies, the Society for Jewish Ethics and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics have roots in earlier SCE Working Groups.

Each Working Group is guaranteed one concurrent session at each Annual Meeting. Working Groups may propose an additional concurrent session, but for the second they must supply a proposal that is evaluated competitively against all other proposals. Working Groups may also elect to meet at night.

Working Groups that are established to serve underrepresented groups may or may not elect to create an associated Interest Group. Currently all three Working Groups also offer Interest Group meetings. This reflects the fact that working group sessions were originally oriented toward mentoring and conducting a business meeting, while the interest group session was to be a more scholarly presentation.

**African and African-American Working Group**

The purpose of this working group, formed in 2003, is to support the work by current African and African American Christian ethicists and to create a systematic process for recruiting future Ph.D. students and for identifying and fostering development of African and African American Ph.D. students in ethics. In particular, the working group: (1) supports the professional development, research, and publications of African and African American ethicists, and convene concurrent sessions and focused interest group discussions at the Annual SCE meeting related to African and African American approaches to ethics. (2) The working group seeks ways to nurture, cultivate, mentor, and support African American Ph. D. students in ethics, towards the successful completion of their degrees and first job placement.

**Latino(a) Working Group**

Members of the Latino/a Working Group, formed in 2007, engage in conversations about the past, present and future of Latino/a Christian ethics in the academy, the church, and society. They address multiple approaches to identify the needs of Latino communities in each of those sectors along with the strategies necessary to meet them as scholars doing teología en conjunto. With that spirit of service in mind, the Group seeks to facilitate a greater presence of Latinos and Latinas in the guild.
Asian and Asian-American Working Group

The Asian and Asian American Working Group was formed in 2008 to promote the scholarly interests, professional development, and representation of Asian and Asian American ethicists in the SCE. We seek to do this by creating an open and inclusive environment for discussion about ethics, fostering collegial and mentoring relationships among its members, and contributing positively to three different "publics" -- various Asian/Asian American communities, the SCE, and the broader field of Christian ethics. Membership is open to anyone who is interested in the stated purposes of the Asian and Asian American Working Group.

SCE Caucuses

Caucuses tend to arise fairly spontaneously, and often do not seek official recognition unless they want space on the program. At this time we have no specified process for creating a caucus. Caucuses are self-governed.

Caucus for Contingent Faculty Concerns

The Caucus for Contingent Faculty Concerns exists to advocate for non-tenure-track faculty within the SCE and in the academy more broadly. We seek to enhance the status of non-tenure-track faculty and independent scholars within the profession and to strengthen ties between tenured and non-tenured faculty. As part of its activities within the Society, the Caucus hosts speakers, panels, and moderated discussions; facilitates networking; gathers data; increases the visibility of contingent faculty; shares strategies; and sponsors concurrent sessions at the annual meeting. Caucus membership is open to all SCE members, regardless of employment or student status. The caucus has three purposes:

- **Awareness and visibility**: Tenured faculty members are often unaware of the extent of the problem, despite the extensive coverage the issue has received in mainstream and academic media. Contingent faculty members often feel inferior to tenured and tenure-track faculty, a feeling that compounds over time as their CVs continue to diverge from their full-time peers. This makes some contingent faculty reluctant to advocate for themselves. A permanent caucus would be a validation of the contributions of contingent faculty, while making their numbers more evident.

- **Accountability**: Such a group could examine the link between doctoral program admissions and the job market; highlight the role of tenured and tenure-track faculty in ameliorating the working conditions of contingent faculty; and call administrators to rethink—or at least justify—exploitative employment practices. This could also include lobbying accrediting bodies to consider ratios of full-time to part-time faculty.

- **Advocacy**: The caucus can also identify and implement strategies to improve the position of contingent faculty, both within the SCE and in academia as a whole, and also serve as a link between SCE’s members and advocates in other parts of the academy. This would include sharing strategies for contingent faculty themselves to cope with or improve conditions, to locate sources of funding for research (often closed if you do not have a permanent institutional affiliation), and to know when to call it quits and seek a more sustainable livelihood. Advocacy should not be seen as limited to contingent faculty, but as inclusive of tenured faculty and administrators.
**Junior Faculty Caucus**

The Junior Faculty Caucus is organized for the purpose of allowing Christian ethicists (pre-tenured Ph.D.’s and teaching ABD’s) to help one another navigate our new roles as professors and scholars. In addition, we hope to encourage greater involvement of newer scholars in the Society of Christian Ethics, and to strengthen our communal voice with an eye toward shaping the SCE’s long-term goals.

**Student Caucus**

This is an opportunity for students to meet, develop friendships, and discuss issues of mutual concern and interest. All students and others interested in issues related to graduate students in ethics are welcome. For more information, or if to be added to our student e-mail list, please contact the co-convener.

**Women’s Caucus**

Women’s Caucus welcomes all women of the SCE. Topics for discussions have ranged from internal SCE policies and goals to issues around teaching and research.

**Global Scholars Program**

N.B. The Global Scholars Program, along with the International Scholarly Relations Committee and associated practices, are being revised in the fall of 2016. The text that appears here reflects 2015-2016 arrangements.

The SCE invites proposals to bring scholars from the Global South to the SCE annual meeting, with travel, accommodations and food at the SCE meetings paid for by the SCE’s International Speakers Fund (ISF). The Global Scholars Program includes a presentation at the SCE meetings as well as on-campus lectures by the visiting scholar immediately after the SCE meetings.

Participating campuses will schedule a public lecture by the visiting scholar, and in turn face these expectations: cover the cost of airfare from the SCE conference site (or from the previous campus), cover all the ordinary costs of a lecture on campus (including an honorarium for the speaker typical for that campus), and a contribute to the ISF to help defray the costs of international travel (which helps replenish the ISF so this process can continue). The size of contribution requested is $500-1000.

Normally, no more than two Global Scholars are approved for a given meeting.

Here is the sequence of events describing a successful application:

1. By the deadline for SCE paper proposals, the nominator submits a proposal to bring a visiting scholar to the SCE annual meetings that will take place in January two academic years in the future (e.g., in the spring of 2018 for the 2020 meeting).
2. At the spring Program Committee meeting, the most promising such proposal is approved, conditionally reserving a slot on the program for the annual meeting two academic years later, and conditionally approving financing for travel, accommodations, and meals. The nominator-turned-organizer must arrange for a few (ideally 3 or 4) on-campus lectures for
the visiting scholar at various campuses in the US or Canada before and/or after the SCE meeting that the visitor attends.

3. The next fall (more than a year ahead of the meeting the visitor will attend), the organizer works to arrange on-campus lectures for the visiting scholar. Organizers are encouraged to advertise this possibility by email circulated by the SCE to the membership. These commitments must be completed before the January meeting, one year ahead of the planned visit, and sent plans to the International Speakers Fund Committee for final approval.

If the International Speakers Committee approves the report, the International Speakers committee informs the Program Committee that funding is now guaranteed (February).

1. The Program Committee assigns an appropriate time slot for the visiting scholar to make his or her presentation. (spring meeting).
2. The organizer finalizes all plans, oversees the purchase of plane tickets for all stops in the visiting scholar’s itinerary, and attends to any other details of the visit (summer).
3. The organizer acts as coordinator of arrangements during the scholar’s time in the US and the scholar’s host at the meeting.

Funding from the International Speakers Fund goes to scholars worldwide, especially those from underrepresented groups and from institutions where limited resources restrict international travel.

**Pre-Conference Meeting Groups**

These groups are different than interest groups only in that they do not report to SCE their activities. Usually, the Society’s sole involvement is in providing space gratis for the groups to meet. If the Executive Administrator also arranges food for these meetings, the group must reimburse the Society for the cost of the meals.

**Baptist Ethicists**

The purpose of this group is to foster fellowship and collaboration among Baptist members of SCE. Our annual gatherings include presentation and discussion of participants' current research and/or a special topic as well as a common meal. Occasionally we also hold joint meetings with other groups.

**Lutheran Ethicists**

The Lutheran Ethicists Gathering is an annual event sponsored by the Department for Studies of the Church in Society program unit of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The two-day gathering fosters scholarship and dialog on topics of interest to participants with particular, though not exclusive, attention paid to themes and insights from within Lutheran traditions of thought as they intersect with discourse in the academy and challenges within the church.

**PCUSA Social Ethics Network**

Presbyterian Ethicists meet at SCE to discuss academic and denominational matters of the Presbyterian Church (USA) and for an update on current developments in social witness in the PCUSA and our Reformed relatives. SCE members participating on study commissions and serving as consultant writers for the denomination report on their projects. The impacts of church/seminary/college changes are discussed. Seminary and college ethicists comprise most of
the group “Social Ethics Network” (or SEN—formerly “Theological Educators for Presbyterian Social Witness”) which helps connect the academy to the denomination and the General Assembly, informing the life of congregations through policy studies and reports. The group sometimes meets in churches near the SCE annual meeting site. Liaison is provided by the Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy, acswp@pcusa.org.

Reformed Theological Ethics Writers

The Reformed Theological Ethics Writers is a small group of constructive ethicists working within the Reformed Christian tradition, who gather together primarily to review, critique, and improve members’ works-in-progress. Membership is by invitation or request, but the small size of the group will be maintained deliberately in order to ensure that the meetings give due attention to each participant’s work.

University of Chicago Writers

In an effort to continue the distinct approach to ethics developed over the years at the University of Chicago Divinity School, the University of Chicago Writers Group was started in the early 1990’s to enable graduates of the Divinity School's ethics programs to gather each year to discuss new and on-going projects. The group gathers on Thursday afternoon prior to the full SCE meeting schedule to discuss members' work distributed in advance. SCE members who are U. of C. graduates and would like to join the group are encouraged to contact the conveners.

Wesleyan/Methodist Ethicists

This group was formed within the SCE of those members (1) who work within any of the various ecclesial traditions rooted in the evangelical renewal movement begun by John Wesley, or (2) whose theological and ethical reflection is shaped by distinctly Wesleyan perspectives.

International Affiliated Associations

Society for the Study of Christian Ethics (SSCE)

Based in the United Kingdom, the Society for the Study of Christian Ethics is a network of theologians, ethicists, teachers, researchers, clergy, and lay Christians who have special interests in the areas of moral theology, moral philosophy, personal and social ethics, and public policy. The SSCE publishes the journal Studies in Christian Ethics. It is a partner organization with the SCE—we waive their representative’s registration and provide housing for three nights (but no travel expenses or meals), and they do the same for the SCE President. Their journal has the largest circulation of any ethics journal outside of North America and aims through its articles and book reviews to engender a style of conversation which is sympathetic, stimulating, challenging and informative. See http://www.ssce.org.uk.

Societas Ethica

Societas Ethica was founded in 1964 in Basel, Switzerland and now has 270 members from over 20 countries. It holds an annual conference. Societas Ethica also publishes a journal, De Ethica. See http://www.societasethica.info/?l=en
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7. Media

The Journal of the SCE

The Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics (JSCE) is published by Georgetown University Press twice a year with a distribution of approximately 1400. The JSCE is comprised of scholarly papers, book reviews, and advertisements. The JSCE grew out of The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics. On the basis of the SCEs 21st Century Report, several changes were implemented: the expansion from an annual to a journal with two issues per year, the addition of book reviews, the solicitation of advertisements, and the electronic availability of essays in full text form through several sources.

Responsibilities of the Co-Editors

The duties and powers of the Co-Editors are discussed extensively in Part 4, “Governance and Management,” in the subsection on Executive Officers. The Co-Editors, in consultation with the President and the Board of Directors, appoint the members of the Editorial Board and the Book Review Editor. All of these appointees must be members of the Society in good standing.

Responsibilities of JSCE Editorial Board Members

- During one’s 4-year term, attend the Annual Meeting and JSCE Board Meeting. If a Board member misses two Journal Board meetings, the Co-Editors will replace him or her, and they will invite an SCE member to serve the remainder of that term.
- Referee three papers at each Annual Meeting.
- Write one book review for the JSCE during the period of Board service.
- Serve on possible subcommittees within the Editorial Board as needed.

Responsibilities of the Book Review Editor

- Identify books authored or edited by SCE members and obtain copies from publishers.
- Solicit reviews from SCE members-at-large and from Editorial Board members.
- Mail books to people who have agreed to review them.
- Attend the Annual Meeting and chair each session of Breakfast with an Author at the Annual Meeting—that is, the Book Review Editor attends the breakfast (at his/her own expense), offers a brief introduction, and is available to attendees as a way of soliciting reviews for the JSCE.
- Attend the meeting of the JSCE Editorial Board at the Annual Meeting.

Electronic Databases

The Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics is also available in electronic form through institutions that subscribe to the databases listed below.

About ATLA

Established in 1946, the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) is a professional association of nearly 1,000 individual, institutional, and affiliate members providing programs, products, and services in support of theological and religious studies libraries and librarians.
ATLA's ecumenical membership represents many religious traditions and denominations.

**ATLASerials® (ATLAS®)**

*ATLASerials® (ATLAS®)* is an online full-text collection of major religion and theology journals used by libraries, librarians, religion scholars, theologians, and clergy.

How to access: Please note that most of ATLA's products are not directly accessible through this website. Two exceptions are the free databases, *Research in Ministry® (RIM®)* and *Cooperative Digital Resources Initiative (CDRI)*. If you are looking for journal articles, abstracts or bibliographic information, ATLA's subscription products are available only through a database aggregator. For more information, visit [Product Access Options and Guidance](#). For information about institutional library subscriptions, contact EBSCO Publishing, [www.ebscohost.com](http://www.ebscohost.com), or Ovid, [www.ovid.com](http://www.ovid.com).

**About Project MUSE**

Project MUSE is a leading provider of digital humanities and social science content for the scholarly community. Since 1995 the MUSE journal collections have supported a wide array of research needs at academic, public, special, and school libraries worldwide. MUSE is the trusted source of complete, full-text versions of scholarly journals from many of the world's leading university presses and scholarly societies, with over 120 publishers currently participating. UPCC Book Collections on Project MUSE, launched in January 2012, offer top quality book-length scholarship, fully integrated with MUSE's scholarly journal content.

- High quality, peer-reviewed, stable content written by the most prestigious authors and scholars in their fields.
- Books and journals from non-profit scholarly publishers, including university presses and societies.
- Once content goes online in MUSE, it stays online, permanently.
- User-friendly platform for research and discovery.
- Search books and journals in one place and at the same time.
- Linking relations with indexing/abstracting/search services facilitate access to MUSE content.
- Alerts and social networking options for sharing discoveries with colleagues.
- Free access to book and journal Tables of Contents and sample full-text journal articles and book chapters without a subscription.

**About JSTOR**

The JSTOR Religion & Theology Collection covers the history and philosophy of religious thought spanning traditions, periods, and critical approaches. The collection contains more than 80 titles, drawn exclusively from existing JSTOR Arts & Sciences collections. It supports religious studies research as well as scholarship in archaeology, literature, philosophy, and more. More than 30 journals in the collection are dedicated to the general study of religion. Another 30 journals are focused on Christianity studies. Theology journals are well represented. Religion & Theology offers more than 15 journals whose archives on JSTOR extend over 100 years. More than a dozen journals are from outside of the United States, including clusters from the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Germany, and Italy.
Journal Referees

Only full members of the SCE may serve as Journal referees. Referees work under the guidance of the SCE Co-Editors and normally either are members of the Journal Editorial Board or volunteer when the call for reviewers is issued during the fall. JSCE referees are expected to review one specified paper (Editorial Board members review up to three) within the time specified; provide specific comments to authors for suggestions, revisions, and other ways to improve the strength of reviewed papers; and contribute to a climate of collaboration by anonymously attending paper presentations of submitted prospective articles, offering meaningful critiques and suggestions to the author(s), and encouragement to both the author(s) and Co-Editors. JSCE referees review and provide feedback on prospective articles to be included in the JSCE (note that to be considered for publication in the JSCE, a paper must first be presented at the Annual Meeting and explicitly submitted by the author for consideration). Referees conduct blind reviews of the submitted paper that is presented orally in full or in part. As part of the review process, referees may take into account their observation of the (oral) paper presentation and the Q&A feedback. Referees may recommend that the papers be accepted as submitted, that it be accepted with specified revisions, or that it be rejected. The directions given to referees and the form they complete can be found in JSCE Appendix C.4.

For further details on the preparation and submission of manuscripts, please see the JSCE Appendix C.1.

Publication Criteria

Evaluation Guidelines: For more information, see also the website, JSCE Appendix C.1, Manuscript Preparation, and JSCE Appendix C.4, Referee Directions and Form.

The JSCE offers speedy publication of high quality work as a service to selected authors who have crafted papers for delivery at the annual meeting of the SCE, and as a service to the members of the Society and of the larger academic community who benefit from the published presentation of these contributions to ethical inquiry. The Co-Editors’ first objective, then, is to discern which of the papers, among those submitted for consideration, represent the most penetrating and fruitful contributions to our common enterprise of inquiry. The system of expert and Editorial review developed by the Editorial Board has been put in place to ensure fairness and equity in the assessment of the quality of the papers available for publication.

In selecting papers for publication, the Co-Editors and Editorial Board will also aim that the JSCE:

- Represents the full scope of the Society's scholarly interests: theological, philosophical, historical, professional, and social ethics; primarily Christian ethics but also Jewish, Islamic, and comparative ethics. This representation will not be possible in any single issue, but the issues of the JSCE, taken together, should reflect this diversity.
- Provides a forum for the work of new scholars (those in the first five years or so beyond the dissertation) and for the articulation of emerging issues and perspectives. Some preference may be given to papers from new scholars or papers on particularly timely topics, but only within the guidelines concerning quality.

Referees and Co-Editors will use the following criteria when evaluating papers:

1. Does the paper make sense? Is it clearly written and comparatively free of jargon? Are the distinctions crisp? Is the argument coherent and accessible? Does the paper offer a strong line of argument with appropriate support and adequate development? Is the argument complex, sophisticated, or unusually elegant?
2. **Is the paper competent?** The issue here is scholarly substance. Is the author familiar with the principal dimensions of the topic and with the established body of relevant literature? Does the author handle sources honestly, resourcefully, and without distortion? Has the author offered an even-handed treatment of the topic or do the author's own commitments bias the presentation in worrisome ways? If the author's position is controversial, does she or he position her or his work in the context of the current debate?

3. **Does the paper make a significant contribution?** Does it offer an analytic, creative, or constructive contribution to the field? Is the work original, provocative, or unusually incisive? Is the argument adventurous? Does it open new possibilities or raising a plausible challenge to the reigning consensus? Does the paper add to, rather than merely repeat, what is already available in the work of others?

The following criteria are strongly encouraged.

1. **Does the paper follow contemporary standards of language use?** The *JSCE* is committed to inclusive, non-discriminatory, and non-inflammatory language.

2. **Does the paper reflect contemporary standards of diversity?** Does the paper follow the recommendations of the “Twenty-First Century Report” and the commitment of the *JSCE* Editorial Board to foster the dialogue among the diverse perspectives present in the SCE and to encourage deliberately this discourse through the critical and sustained engagement of the work of scholars who are currently underrepresented in the academy?

3. **Does the paper advance interdisciplinary approaches and/or methodologies?** Has the author used another discipline’s hermeneutic to explore and value the questions of ethical inquiry? Does the paper deliver insight from another discipline’s tools of investigation? Is the methodology sufficiently presented?

4. **Is the paper of general interest?** Does it address important ethical questions? Does it draw upon religious and theological resources in addressing these questions? Will the paper interest large numbers of the Society's members, however specialized its particular subject matter may be?

---

**Permission to Reprint Articles that have Appeared in the *JSCE***

Permission must be sought prior to copying or reprinting. The Society of Christian Ethics owns the copyright to the *JSCE*. Person seeking permission needs to submit a request to the SCE. See *JSCE Appendix C.3* or [SCE website](https://www.scejournal.org) for form. The Executive Administrator currently grants permission by sending a letter on letterhead after receiving the request which should be submitted on the form. Executive Administrator also tracks whether any payment is needed and forwards payment to article author if applicable.

Course Packets: The SCE requires no permission fee for including published articles in course packets. The SCE does ask that that those reproducing articles for this purpose (1) indicate “reprinted by permission of the JSCE, [date]” on the first page of the reprinted article and (2) notify the SCE ([sce@scethics.org](mailto:sce@scethics.org)) which article is being used and the name and level of the course.

The fee normally charged for inclusion of an article in a published work is:

- $100 per article if the Editor is not the author of the article. Half of this fee ($50) will be forwarded to the author of the article if the author’s address is known.
- No fee is charged if the Editor is the author of the article.

An exception is made to this policy in cases that meet the following four criteria:
1. The press/publisher who brings out the volume is also the press/publisher who brings out the *JSCE*.
2. The copyright to the essay is presumptively or explicitly held either by that publisher or the SCE.
3. The essays to be included in the volume are exclusively from the *JSCE* and/or the *Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics*.
4. The editors of the volume are members of the SCE,

In such exceptional cases, the Society will waive the $50 honorarium for the authors, so long as the press and editors agree to provide each contributor with (a) early notice of their intent to republish the essay and (b) at least one gratis copy of the published collection. In addition, the editors and publisher should agree that if sales surpass a particular threshold (1,000 copies seems reasonable but the actual figure may need to be negotiated with the publisher), the press will, at that point, pay each of the authors the usual $50 honorarium.

### Ads in the *JSCE*

The *JSCE* is published twice a year with a distribution of approximately 1400. Advertisements may include books published, graduate programs, summer programs and conferences. 2015 cost: $400 for single full page ad, $270 for half page ad, 15% reduction (total cost $680) if a full-page ad reservation is made and paid in advance for 2 issues.

Mechanical specifications:
- 5" x 7" (full page). The trim size of the book is 6" x 9".
- Black and white only.
- Please email ads in a pdf or jpg file with the resolution at 300 dpi.
- Copy due no later than September 30 for Fall issue; March 31 for Spring issue.

### Book Reviews

Publishers are invited to submit books to be considered for review in the *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*. Please send only books written or edited by a member of the Society of Christian Ethics, the Society of Jewish Ethics and/or the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics. Membership status can be confirmed with Executive Administrator at sce@scethics.org. Unsolicited book reviews are not accepted. Books should be mailed to

*Kathryn Blanchard*

*Alma College*

*614 W Superior St*

*Alma MI 48801*

### Display and Exhibits at Annual Meeting

Display/exhibit space is available at the annual meetings of the Society of Christian Ethics. On average 600 members and interested others attend the meeting each year. Exhibits are ordinarily located in the break hall where people browse, buy, and gather. The meeting runs concurrently with the Society of Jewish Ethics and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics. We encourage publishers to include books that might be of interest to ethicists of all religious traditions. Display/exhibit space reservations are due by November 1.
Mailing List

The mailing list of the Society of Christian Ethics membership (full, or US members only) is available for purchase only by organizations of interest to the members (publishers, conference organizers, academic programs, etc.), not by private persons or individual members. The 2016 cost is $150 for a one-time use only. Payment and a draft of the mailing must be received before the list is sent. The list can be mailed on labels or emailed in an Excel file. Email addresses are not shared.

Advertisements in the Annual Meeting Program

Ad space in the printed program of the Annual Meeting is granted on a first come basis. Ads must be submitted by email file in the correct size, in black and white, and ready for print. The 2016 prices are as follows.

- Back cover: $350 full page
- Other locations: $225 full page
- Full page is 8 ½ x 11 with 1.5” margins
- Copy due no later than November 1.
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8. Appendices

Most of the appendices that follow are official documents of the Society of Christian Ethics. Many of them are also available on the official SCE website at https://scethics.org/home. If there is any discrepancy between the text on the website and the text in this document, consider the version on the website to be the authoritative one.

Reports are reproduced in these appendices exactly as they were submitted. Actions of the Board are reproduced with exactly the text that was voted on by the Board.

Return to Table of Contents
A. Governance Appendices

Governance Appendix A.1:
Society of Christian Ethics Bylaws

Nota Bene: The bylaws reproduced here are the bylaws that are in effect and will be in effect until January 2017. Proposed revisions to these bylaws will be circulated in the 2017 Call to Meeting, and the revisions, already approved by the Board, will come to the Membership for approval in January 2017. These bylaws reflect the Society’s past structure of governance; the revised bylaws will reflect the new structures and offices specified in this manual.

ARTICLE I
Name

The name of this organization shall be The Society of Christian Ethics.

ARTICLE II
Purpose

The purpose of the Society shall be to promote scholarly work in the field of Christian ethics and in the relation of Christian ethics to other traditions of ethics and to social, economic, political, and cultural problems; to encourage and improve the teaching of these fields in colleges, universities and theological schools; and to provide a community of discourse and debate for those engaged professionally within these general fields.

ARTICLE III
Membership

Section 1. Eligibility

Persons eligible for membership shall include (1) college, university, or seminary teachers of Christian ethics or social ethics; (2) persons teaching in similar institutions in other fields who are concerned with the relation of Christian ethics to their subject matter; and (3) persons whose full-time professional work in church, government, social agency or elsewhere is related to the purposes of the Society. A prerequisite for membership is at least one of the following: a Ph.D. or equivalent degree, scholarly publications in the above-named fields, or a full-time teaching position in ethics and/or related fields in an accredited institution of higher education.

Doctoral students in ethics or related fields may become members of the Society upon matriculation into a doctoral program. This status ordinarily may be retained for not more than ten years.

Section 2. Election to Membership
Membership in the Society shall be granted by a majority vote of the Board of Directors. Applications for membership shall be made in writing to the Executive Director, who shall present the same to the Board of Directors for its action.

Section 3. Conduct of Members in the Internal Scholarly and Organizational Activities of the Society

The Society will conduct all its business in a manner appropriate to its purposes (see Article II), and expects members to conduct themselves within the Society in a manner appropriate to the purposes of the Society. Achievement of those purposes—the formation of a community of discourse, debate, and research which engages in scholarly work in and teaching of Christian ethics in relation to social, economic, political, and cultural problems—requires members to respect both the basic human dignity of all persons and the recognized social and political rights of individuals which proceed from that dignity. Society members, agents, or employees acting within the Society will therefore refrain from any form of harassment or unjust discrimination, in deed or word, based in race, sex, age, nationality, ethnicity, religious community, sexual orientation, or physical condition. Respect for the work and property of others will exclude plagiarism, copyright infringement, and unacknowledged use of the research of others.

Nothing in this Article shall be interpreted to prohibit members of the Society from articulating the positions of their respective belief systems, religious traditions or ecclesial communions, nor shall this Article be interpreted to prohibit open and vigorous discussion of controversial issues by members of the Society, both within its meetings and elsewhere.

Section 4. Life Membership

Upon recommendation by the Executive Director, Life Membership without payment of dues will be granted by the Board of Directors to those who have retired and who have been members in good standing of the Society for at least 25 years. In exceptional circumstances, on recommendation of the Executive Director, a member having retired, but having less than 25 years of membership in good standing in the Society, may be granted life membership by a majority vote of the Board of Directors.

Section 5. Maintenance of Membership

Membership in the Society shall be maintained by payment of the annual dues. Membership shall be terminated by resignation or by failure to pay annual dues. Reinstatement of membership will automatically accompany the payment of annual dues.

Section 6. Dues

The Board of Directors shall set membership dues, which shall run for the calendar year.

Section 7. Termination of Membership for Cause

Membership in the Society may be terminated, suspended, or restricted for cause by vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the members of the Board of Directors. The Board shall provide the members in question with no less than fifteen (15) days’ prior written notice of the proposed expulsion, suspension, termination, or restriction and the reasons therefore. The Board shall also provide an opportunity for the members to be heard by the Board, orally or in writing, not less than five (5) days before the effective date of the expulsion, suspension, termination, or restriction. It shall be the responsibility of the President of the Society, working together with the Executive Director, to
formulate and implement further details of a procedure that are fair and reasonable given the circumstances of the case, including but not limited to its timing relative to the regularly scheduled meetings of the Board, and the geographic proximity of the member in question and the members of the Board. Nothing in this provision shall be construed to limit the right of the Society to terminate, suspend, or restrict membership for non-payment of dues.

ARTICLE IV
Meetings

The Society shall hold an Annual Meeting at a time and place to be determined by the Board of Directors or its Executive Committee, for the reading and discussing of scholarly papers, election of officers, and the conduct of the Society's official business. A quorum for conducting business at the Annual Meeting shall consist of a number of members equal to 10% of the membership in the Society at the time of the Annual Meeting.

ARTICLE V
Officers

The Officers of the Society are the President, the President Elect, the Vice President, and the Treasurer.

Section 1. President

The President shall serve for a term of one year commencing with the adjournment of the Annual Meeting, and shall be selected in accordance with the procedure described in Article V, Section 2. The President shall preside at the Annual Meeting and at the meetings of the Board of Directors, and shall receive, together with the Board, reports from the Executive Director and shall have and exercise such other powers and duties as may be prescribed by the Board. The President shall customarily deliver a "Presidential Address" to the membership at the Annual Meeting.

Section 2. Vice President

The Vice President shall serve for a term of one year commencing with the adjournment of the Annual Meeting. The Vice President shall be elected by a majority vote of members present and voting at the Annual Meeting of the Society. The Vice President shall be President-Designate, and shall automatically succeed to the office of President after the completion of a one-year term. In the event of the resignation, death, or incapacity of the President, the Vice President shall serve as acting President of the Society, and shall perform such presidential duties as the Board of Directors deems appropriate. In the event of the resignation, death, or incapacity of the Vice President, the Board of Directors, in consultation with the Nominating Committee, shall arrange for a replacement in a timely fashion.

Section 3. Secretary

The Vice President shall serve as Secretary of the Society.

Section 4. Past President

After serving out the term, the retiring President shall automatically become Past President and serve as a member of the Board of Directors for a one-year term. In the event that the Past President resigns or in unable to complete her or his term, the Office shall remain vacant until the
current President succeeds to it at the end of her or his one-year presidential term, and such duties as the Past President was to perform will be assigned to other officers by the President.

Section 5. Executive Director

The Executive Director shall be appointed by the Board of Directors. The Executive Director shall serve as Secretary of the Society. The Executive Director shall have responsibility for preparing the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Directors and of the Members. He or she shall give or cause to be given notices of all such meetings, shall authenticate records of the Society, and shall see that records and reports are properly kept and filed by the Society. The Executive Director, with the assistance of the Treasurer, shall prepare or oversee the preparation of all reports and filings required by the State of Tennessee, the Internal Revenue Service, and other government agencies.

The Executive Director, in consultation and cooperation with the Board of Directors, the Executive Committee, and the Program Committee, shall coordinate the planning and execution of the Annual Meeting and all activities associated with it, including but not limited to the selection and of meeting sites, the production of the Annual Meeting Program, and the provision of materials and facilities needed at the Annual Meeting. The Executive Director shall have the authority to execute on behalf of the Society any contracts and other legal documents that he or she reasonably deems necessary to further the successful occurrence of the Annual Meeting and any other regular or special meetings of the Society or its Committees. The Executive Director shall serve ex officio as a member of the Executive Committee. The Executive Director shall have other such duties and powers as designated by the Board of Directors.

Section 6. Treasurer.

The Treasurer shall be appointed by the Board of Directors. The Treasurer shall be in charge of the Society’s financial affairs, books of account, accounting records or procedures, funds, securities and valuable papers, and shall keep full and accurate records thereof. The Treasurer shall render to the Executive Director and to the Board of Directors at their request an account of all transactions by the treasurer and of the financial condition of the Society. The treasurer shall assist the Executive Director in preparation of all reports and filings required by the State of Tennessee, the Internal Revenue Service, and other government agencies. The treasurer shall have such other duties and powers as designated by the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE VI
Board of Directors

The Board of Directors shall consist of the following members: the President, the Vice President, the immediate Past President, the Executive Director, the Editor or Co-Editors of the Journal, twelve (12) other members elected by majority vote of the members present and voting at the Annual Meeting in classes of three for terms of four years. A Director elected at the Annual Meeting may be elected to another term, but only after an interval of at least one year. The Board of Directors shall meet during the twenty-four hours prior to the Annual Meeting of the Society, and at such other times as the President shall convene them. The Board of Directors shall have power to act on all matters concerning the activities and business of the Society, shall authorize the expenditure of the Society's funds and provide for the proper auditing of its accounts, and shall have the power to act for the Society in all matters of policy and program between Annual Meetings. It shall present to the Annual Meeting a report of its actions, which report shall be subject to approval of the members present. Seven of the members shall constitute a quorum for the Board of Directors.
There shall be an Executive Committee of the Board of Directors, consisting of the President, Vice President, and at least two members of the Board of Directors appointed by the President. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for planning the program for the Annual Meeting, shall prepare and present to the Board of Directors an agenda for each of its meetings, and shall otherwise advise the Board in the discharge of its responsibilities. The Executive Committee shall have power to act, if necessary, for the Board of Directors between its meetings. The Executive Director shall be an ex officio member of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VII
Archivist

The Archivist shall be appointed for a term of four years by the Board of Directors and confirmed by a majority vote of the membership present and voting at the earliest Annual Meeting. The Archivist may be reappointed. The Archivist shall see that materials are collected for the Society's archives; shall encourage members to contribute materials that may not be included in the files of the Society's officers; shall, working with the Executive Director, the President, the Editor or Co-Editors of the Journal, and any other appropriate persons, make regular deposits to the archives accompanied by directories of file titles in each shipment; and shall be a liaison between the Society and the library that is the official repository of the archives.

ARTICLE VIII
Committees

Section 1. Nominating Committee

The Nominating Committee shall be chaired by a member of the Board of Directors and consist of four other members of the Society (not members of the Board of Directors) appointed by the President from among those present at the Annual Meeting. The Nominating Committee shall present at the Annual Meeting nominations to fill expiring terms and vacancies. Nominations for any office may also be made from the floor, subject to the movers having the person's consent to be nominated.

Section 2. Other Committees

The President may appoint such other committees as are necessary.

ARTICLE IX
Publications

Section 1. Authorization

The Society shall publish at least once each year a volume containing selected papers presented at the Annual Meeting, normally including the Presidential Address, and such professional materials as may be determined and arranged by the Editor or Co-Editors and the Editorial Board charged with its planning and production.

Section 2. Name

This publication shall be called the Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics, hereafter referred to as the Journal.
Section 3. Editor/Co-Editors

An Editor or Co-Editors shall be appointed by the Board of Directors, following a search, and confirmed for a term of five years by majority vote of the membership present and voting at the earliest Annual Meeting. The Editor or Co-Editors, in consultation with the Editorial Board, shall be responsible for soliciting and selecting materials to be included in the Journal, for overseeing the publication process, for supervising and assisting with promotion of sales, and for delivering papers presented at the Annual Meeting and submitted to the Journal to the Society Archivist. The Editor or Co-Editors shall report on the work of the Journal to the membership through the Board of Directors and shall present to the Board of Directors an annual budget for publishing and publicizing the Journal.

Section 4. Editorial Board

An Editorial Board of no fewer than six (6) members shall advise and assist the Editor or Co-Editors in the preparation and publication of the Journal. Members of this Board shall serve three-year staggered terms. They shall be appointed by the President of the Society in consultation with the Editor or Co-Editors and the Board of Directors.

Section 5. Paper Selection

At the discretion of the authors, papers presented at the Annual Meeting shall be considered for inclusion in the Journal. The Editor or Co-Editors and the Editorial Board shall determine procedures and criteria for paper selection. They shall appoint additional persons to assist in the review and assessment of these papers. Final decisions on publication shall reside with the Editor or Co-Editors, guided by the advice of the Editorial Board.

ARTICLE X
Sections

Section 1. Authorization of Sections

The Board of Directors may authorize the formation of, and establish the boundaries of, regional sections of the Society. It may also revoke such authorization or redefine such boundaries.

Section 2. Membership and Section Officers

The membership of a section shall be drawn from members in good standing with the Society and who are resident within the boundaries of the regional section. Sections may elect whatever officers they deem appropriate. One officer shall be designated to provide an annual report to the Society's Board of Directors.

Section 3. Finances

The Board of Directors may allot funds to support the activities of sections when it is desirable to do so. No section shall levy additional membership dues.

Section 4. Meetings

Sections may arrange meetings at appropriate times, provided they do not conflict with the Annual Meeting of the Society.
Amendments

These Bylaws may be amended by vote of the majority of the members present and voting at the Annual Meeting, the Call to Meeting shall contain notice of any proposed amendment, and shall include a copy or summary of the amendment and state the general nature of the amendment. The Board of Directors shall discuss the proposed amendment at a meeting of the Board prior to the Annual Meeting, and shall take a consultative vote regarding whether it should be adopted, the results of which vote shall be presented by the President or the Executive Director to the membership at the Annual Meeting prior to the vote of the members regarding the proposed amendment.

These Bylaws may also be amended by vote of the majority of the Board of Directors, which shall exercise this power between Annual Meetings only to make clerical or minor ministerial changes to the Bylaws, or to make changes necessary to conform to applicable law or to protect fundamental legal or financial interests of the Society. In the event that the Board of Directors exercises this power to amend the Bylaws, it shall provide notice of the amendment and its rationale to the membership in the Call to Meeting.

Coda to the Bylaws

Society of Christian Ethics

Declaration of Professional Commitments

The purpose of the Society of Christian Ethics is to promote scholarly work in the field of Christian ethics and in the relation of Christian ethics to other traditions of ethics and to social, economic, political, and cultural problems; to encourage and improve the teaching of these fields in colleges, universities and theological schools; and to provide a community of discourse and debate for those engaged professionally within these general fields. (Bylaws, Art. II) In pursuit of this purpose members of the Society have particular professional commitments and responsibilities.

As scholars in the field of ethics we hold ourselves to a standard of free, rigorous, and intellectually honest inquiry aiming to advance moral understanding, especially in regard to theologically informed perspectives. Our examination of moral issues shall respect the dignity of persons whose practices and positions we study. Likewise, our engagement with other disciplines and ethical and religious traditions shall be conducted with the aim of mutual learning and understanding. We seek to promote critical and constructive understandings of justice, the well being of society and the good of the wider creation.

As participants in institutions we will foster just relationships with their members and constituencies -- especially students, graduate assistants, colleagues, staff, clients, and patients -- as well as with the communities these institutions affect.

As educators we will strive to improve the methods and intellectual depth of our teaching. We will exercise our authority justly with concern for the development of our students, respecting their dignity and the boundaries appropriate to professional interaction.

As members of the Society we will conduct inquiry, debate and other interactions with colleagues openly, fairly, and respectfully. We will execute our duties competently and justly without prejudice toward those with different values and viewpoints. We will welcome and take action to
ensure the full participation of new and junior members and those who bring new voices to our conversations.

In recent years we have become keenly aware that certain conduct so clearly affronts the dignity of persons that it contravenes the minimal conditions for participation in our profession. Accordingly, in activities that occur under the auspices of the Society we will neither practice nor tolerate any form of harassment or unjust discrimination, in deed or word, based on race, sex, nationality, ethnicity, religious community, sexual orientation, age, or physical condition. Neither will we practice nor tolerate plagiarism, copyright infringement, and unacknowledged use of the research of others. (Cf. Bylaws, Art. III, Sec. 3.) Persons who engage in such conduct within the Society's activities shall be subject to whatever grievance procedures the Society may adopt.

We will publicize these commitments and renew them by regular examination and revision.

N.B. The text of the Bylaws and Coda is based on the document as amended at the 2006 Society of Christian Ethics annual meeting.
Governance Appendix A.2:
Template for Committees of the Board and the Society (Showing Committee Appointments to be Made Annually by the President Elect)

NOTE: On committees 4, 5, and 6, the assignments for Board Members extend through the full four years of their Board membership. As one member (usually the Chair) rotates off, the rising President will assign a newly elected member to the committee and the senior member will normally become the Chair. Under normal circumstances all members of a committee will eventually serve as Chair, but only after experience on the committee. On committee 7, the vice chair normally becomes the chair in January and the chair leaves the committee.

1. Executive Committee (the additional members are normally appointed in fall for the next spring’s meeting):
   - Vice President
   - President Elect
   - President
   - Past President
   - At least two members of the Board, appointed by the President. Customarily, these are the Journal Editor (or both Editors) and the chairs of the three Board committees
   - Treasurer, *ex officio*
   - Executive Director (Executive Director of Strategic Planning), *ex officio*
   - Executive Administrator, *ex officio*

2. Program Committee (the additional members are normally appointed in fall for the next spring’s meeting):
   - Vice President
   - President Elect
   - President
   - Past President
   - *Journal* Editor(s)
   - Member of the Society appointed by the President, normally from the locale of the upcoming conference
   - Three Board members, normally the chairs of the three Board committees
   - Executive Director (Executive Director of Strategic Planning), *ex officio*
   - Executive Administrator, *ex officio*

3. Nominating Committee (The President Elect normally appoints in late summer or early fall to create the ballot for the business meeting held during her or his presidency):
   - Continuing member of the Board (Chair)
   - 4 other members of the Society at large

4. Finance and Long-Term Planning Committee:
   - Treasurer
   - President
   - One Board member from each class; the most senior in Board service normally serves as Chair
   - Executive Administrator, *ex officio*

5. Personnel Committee:
Vice President
Past President
One Board member from each class; the most senior in Board service normally serves as Chair

6. Technology, Archives, and Inter-Society Relations Committee:
   President Elect
   Executive Administrator, ex officio, with voice but no vote
   One Board member from each class; the most senior in Board service normally serves as chair

7. International Scholarly Relations Committee (vice chair becomes chair in January)
   President
   Executive Administrator, ex officio, with voice but no vote
   Chair
   Vice Chair
   Two other members of the Society at large
   SSME representative
   SJE representative
   Richard Brown, ex officio

8. Lifetime Achievement Award Committee
   Past President (Chair)
   Three outgoing Board members

9. Professional Conduct Committee: Six senior members of the SCE with staggered terms of three years. Chair and annual replacements for outgoing members appointed by the President in consultation with the current PCC Chair.

10. Professional Development Committee:
    Past President
    Executive Director (Executive Director of Strategic Planning), ex officio, with voice but no vote
    Board member, appointed by the President (Chair)
    Three additional members of the Society at large, with staggered terms of three years, including one student. President appoints a new member annually.
Governance Appendix A.3:  
Nominating Committee Procedures

Suggestions for SCE Office:
A. Provide a time-line for the process: particularly a date by which suggested nominations must be received by the nominating committee and the date by which the slate of nominees is to be submitted by the nominating committee to the Executive Administrator.
B. Create mechanisms to facilitate greater participation from the membership, such as:
   1. Include a nomination form in the annual meeting letter and in the materials handed out at the annual meeting which can be returned to a “nominations box” on the registration table.
   2. Provide an on-line site at which nomination suggestions can be made by a specified date; the results to be sent to the chair of the nominations committee; or simply make the chair’s e-mail address easily accessible.
   3. Such mechanisms would not take the place of including oral announcements at the SCE business meeting.
C. Make available to the membership the full c.v. of all nominees: perhaps a website promoted in the written materials sent to members about the annual meeting.
D. As soon as the nominating committee is confirmed, make available to the chair and members the resources of the SCE office including
   1. List of members, not including student members
   2. List of nominees and outcomes from SCE history
   3. Availability of additional information about members’ activities with the Society
E. Encourage members to up-date and correct their information on the SCE website, including racial/ethnic identity; consider the possibility of providing a means by which
F. Members’ abbreviated c.v.’s could be posted on the SCE site.

Suggestions for the Nominating Committee:
A. Chairs may want to contact previous nominating committee chairs to learn from their experience.
B. Begin early. Use the summer and fall to go through the SCE membership list, contact colleagues and networks. Each member should bring the names of several potential candidates to the first meeting.
C. Hold two meetings at the SCE annual meeting:
   1. Hold first meeting early to discuss the criteria important to the nominating committee by which candidates will be assessed and to share the names committee members have already identified
   2. Use the annual meeting to encourage SCE members to submit suggested candidates.
   3. Contact the chairs or moderators of Working Groups and Interest Groups for their input.
   4. Attend sessions at which potential candidates are presenting.
   5. Hold second meeting near the close of the SCE meeting to discuss what has been learned and accomplished, to prioritize names in hand, to make assignments as to who will contact whom.
D. Until the deadline for suggestions has been reached, contact potential candidates as to their willingness to serve; make their c.v.’s available to the committee.
E. Setting up a website group on which to list candidates and their responses and to file their c.v.’s is very helpful.
F. Voting by conference call or e-mail. Skype is useful for conference calls.
G. Contact the nominating committee’s choices and confirm their willingness to be nominated.
H. Contact and thank all those who were willing to be considered and had not been selected.
I. Submit slate of nominations to President and SCE Office by deadline.

**Thoughts about Qualifications**

The SCE does not have a formal, binding list of qualifications for office. The following are some thoughts that may be helpful in selecting candidates.

A. It is important to remember that the positions are not merely honorific; those who serve on the Board have significant ongoing responsibility not only for the scholarly well-being of the SCE, but also for its financial and organizational well-being. So people who agree to serve on the Board need to be willing to take on the responsibility of helping to run the business of the society. This is *a fortiori* the case with the vice presidency/presidency.

B. Given the responsibilities associated with service on the Board, it is generally good to look to people who have already passed the tenure hurdle.
   1. This strategy minimizes potential for conflict of interest, since Board members should not hesitate to do what they need to do (e.g., challenge a policy they think is unwise) out of fear of career advancement.
   2. The early years of one's career often show important growth in judgment, and provide the opportunity to hone essential skills in collaborative decision-making, which facilitates the work of the Board. As a general rule, we don't want the SCE Board to be the first important committee a person serves on.
   3. The pre-tenure years also provide an opportunity for SCE members to demonstrate commitment to SCE by participating in its work in other ways.

C. Given the emphasis that the SCE membership tends to place on prior involvement in the work of the society in its selection of officers, a good place to look for candidates for vp/p is the list of prior members of the Board of directors, as well as other important standing committees.

D. Having a diverse Board is extremely important.
   1. Certainly the nominating committee needs to be attentive to diversity with regard to the traditional categories such race, gender, etc.
   2. But there are other types of diversity that are relevant to the SCE’s own work.
      i. Where was the candidate trained? We don't want Board members with Ph.D.’s only from only one or two schools.
      ii. Where does the candidate teach? A seminary? A secular department of religious studies? A religiously affiliated theology department? We have members in all settings.
      iii. What area of the country (or the globe) does the candidate live and work in? Ethical issues can look different on the border with Mexico than they do in inner city Chicago.
      iv. What area does the candidate specialize in? What methodology do they use? Who are their conversation partners? We have a broad membership, and a Board that reflects their breadth of concern can be very helpful.
   3. Needless to say, perfect diversity is impossible. Qualifications and commitment and judgment are the most important issues to consider in selecting candidates for office at SCE. But these other factors can be kept in mind as well.

Written by Gloria Albrecht, edited by M. Cathleen Kaveny, 2014
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### Governance Appendix A.4: Membership of the Program Committee

**Approved May 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voting power</th>
<th>Voting power</th>
<th>Elected</th>
<th>Diverse Perspectives</th>
<th>Fresh Perspectives</th>
<th>Continuity</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>numerical</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of</td>
<td>25% of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>program</td>
<td>program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Elect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Ed 1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Ed 2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Rep</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Caucus</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a WG</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-AA WG</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-AA WG</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Strategic</td>
<td>Non-voting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Non-voting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 members, 15 empowered to vote in phase 1
12 meet Face-to-Face, 10 empowered to vote in phase 2

**For logistical purposes**

The three elected representatives would be the 2nd year class of the Board of Directors.

**Voting Balance, phase 1 (75% of program)**

Persons elected by membership as a whole have 64% of the voting power
Persons representing Working Groups/Caucuses have 18% of the voting power
Appointed persons have 18% of the voting power

**Voting Balance, phase 2 (25% of program)**

Persons elected by membership as a whole have 70% of the voting power
Appointed persons have 30% of the voting power

**Diversity**

of the membership, and who is currently on the Board, the Past Pres., Pres., VP, PE, and elected representatives could also represent diverse perspectives.

**Fresh perspectives**

At least six of the 15 members of the committee, prima facie, would represent fresh perspectives. If we required the Student Caucus, Women's Caucus and WG's to rotate their representative each year, that would increase this number to 11 of 15.

[Return to Governance and Management](#)
Governance Appendix A.5:
Governance Reports Prepared for the Board

Report of the Committee on the Structure of the SCE
Doug Ottati, Chair
Submitted April 2013

President Allen Verhey appointed the Committee on the Structure of the SCE near the end of January 2013, and asked that it report to the Board at its Executive Committee meeting in April 2013. The committee consisted of Cathleen Kaveny, Douglas Ottati (chair), Peter Paris, and Gina Wolfe. It was charged “to begin consideration of the organizational structure of the SCE,” by (1) reviewing the history of the current structure, (2) making proposals aimed at improving regular communication within the organization, and (3) encouraging the Board to reflect about possible structural changes. [See Appendix A, The Charge to the Committee on the Structure of the SCE.]

The Committee held regular conference calls from early February through mid-April. It contacted past Executive Directors and Editors, as well as the current Executive Director, Associate Executive Director, and Co-Editors. It reviewed current position descriptions and related materials for the President, the Executive Director, the Associate Executive Director, the Co-Editors of the Journal, and the Treasurer. [See Appendix B, Position Descriptions and Related Materials.]

On the basis of its information gathering and reflection, the Committee now submits its report in three parts: (1) a brief history of how the current structure and positions have come to be as they are, (2) immediate recommendations intended to improve the functioning of the present structure, and (3) a recommendation that a subsequent committee be appointed to undertake a study of long-term organizational possibilities, ranging from a revision and clarification of the current structure to restructuring the organization to outsourcing a number of administrative functions.

I. A Brief History of the Current Organizational Structure

Office of Executive Director

In 1994, during John Cartwright’s tenure (1991-1995), the title of Executive Secretary was changed to that of Executive Director. John Cartwright, who was on the faculty of Boston University School of Theology, was assisted in his duties by one of his doctoral students as had been the custom with his predecessors. His term of office was the last to use the model of a graduate student being assigned to assist the Executive Director. His successor, Dennis McCann (1996-2000), was, at the time of his appointment, a member of the Religious Studies Department of DePaul University, which did not have any graduate programs. Based on negotiations with the Board, it was agreed that his wife, Leslie McCann, would assist him; she received a stipend from the SCE. As a result of concerns that had been raised about this approach, a different model was put into place with his successor, Gina Wolfe (2001-2005) who was on the faculty of the School of Theology-Seminary (SOT) at Saint John’s University (MN).

Though Saint John’s had graduate programs, thus making it possible to revert to the earlier model, it was decided that such a move was no longer viable given the growth in membership and needs of the SCE. As a result, Harlan Beckley, then President of the SCE, negotiated terms with the Dean of the SOT to ensure that the Executive Director would have sufficient support to fulfill the
duties of the office. This included assigning an SOT staff member to be an administrative assistant (part-time position averaging 15-20 hours/week) as well as providing two work study students to the Executive Director’s office. The SOT also agreed to provide the Executive Director’s office with office space, telephones, a dedicated phone line, file cabinets, other general office equipment, an email address, and assistance with website development (no website existed at the time). In addition, the Executive Director’s office would have use of SOT duplicating and mailroom facilities. In return, the SCE paid an annual fee to the SOT to cover salary and benefits for the assistant and stipends for the work study students. Direct charges incurred for duplicating, mailings, and telephone calls were reimbursed on a monthly basis. The SCE also reimbursed the SOT for direct expenses incurred in developing and maintaining the website. The Dean named Linda Schreiber, the SOT events coordinator, the Executive Director’s assistant. Since she was an employee of the SOT who reported directly to the Dean, he conducted her annual job performance review. Prior to that review the Dean asked the Executive Director for feedback on her performance.

In 2004, Gina Wolfe accepted an appointment to the faculty of the Brennan School of Business at Dominican University in River Forest, IL. Given the nature of the appointment, replicating the existing arrangement was not possible. The Dean of the SOT, however, agreed to continue the existing arrangement through the remainder of her term in office. In consultation with the SCE’s leadership and in view of advances in technology, it was agreed that this was a viable option and that it might also act as a trial period to determine whether or not the “working” office of the Executive Director needed to be moved physically every five years following the appointment of a new Executive Director. The arrangement worked well and it was determined that the stipulation that the Executive Director’s home institution be willing to physically house the office would not be an absolute requirement but an option depending on the preferences of the incoming Executive Director and his or her home institution.

As a result with the appointment of Stewart Hermann (2006-2010) yet another model for staffing the office of the Executive Director was adopted. The decision was made to invite Linda Schreiber to continue working for the SCE and to take on additional responsibilities. The position of Assistant to the Executive Director was changed to that of Associate Executive Director to reflect the increased duties. Given the increase in duties and the lack of formal affiliation of the incoming Executive Director, the existing arrangement with Saint John’s School of Theology-Seminary was no longer feasible. Jean Porter, then President of the SCE, and Bill Werpehowski, then Vice President of the SCE, traveled to Concordia College (Moorhead, MN), Stewart Herman’s home institution, to meet with representative of the Administration to discuss arrangements with Concordia College. Those discussions resulted in Linda Schreiber becoming an employee of Concordia College. The SCE paid an annual fee to Concordia College; the fee covered salary and benefits for the Associate Executive Director as well as other direct expenses that the SCE incurred, such as telephone use charges.

It is important to note, that though Linda Schreiber became an employee of Concordia College, she did not relocate from St. Cloud, MN where she lived; the SCE’s office equipment, files, and other materials were moved from Saint John’s University to her home, where the “working” office continues to be maintained. With these new arrangements, the practice of a formal annual performance review lapsed.

During Stewart Herman’s term in office, the work of the Executive Director’s office expanded. Some of this was a result of new initiatives and activities of the Board, some a result of expanding relationships with the Society for Jewish Ethics and the newly established Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics, and some a result of general growth in membership services, such as the website. Over this five year period, the workload of the Associate Executive Director increased from 50%
FTE to 90% FTE. With the appointment of Stacey Floyd-Thomas as Executive Director (2011-present) whose home institution was not able to be the Associate Executive Director’s employer of record, the model changed again. Thus, at the end of Stewart Herman’s term of office, arrangements were made to have the salary and benefits of the Associate Executive Directed managed by a payroll services company. The SCE became Linda Schreiber’s direct employer.

It should also be noted that at the time of Stewart Herman’s appointment, the treasury function was split from the direct responsibilities of the Executive Director. This meant the establishment of the office of Treasurer which required a change in the by-laws; Gina Wolfe acted as interim treasurer until the 2006 annual meeting when the membership approved the change in the by-laws and a Treasurer was appointed. One practical result of this change was that the check signing responsibility shifted from the Executive Director to the Associate Executive Director. The requirement that checks in the amount of $5,000 or more have a second signatory remained in place. Dan Finn, past Board member and past President of the SCE who is on the faculty of Saint John’s University (MN), has served the SCE in this capacity since 2001 when Gina Wolfe instituted the practice.

As this brief history indicates, there has not been a consistent model of staffing the Executive Director’s office since 1996. The changes and modifications to the way in which the office has been staffed are a result of many factors such as:
- Growth in membership and expanding needs of the office, such as website maintenance and coordination with the affiliated societies
- Decrease in interest in serving as Executive Director among members who have been nominated for the position
- Budget cuts or freezes across higher education that result in Deans and/or Department Chairs being unable to agree to provide the support needed to enable a member the SCE to serve as Executive Director

While it may not have appeared so when they were made, in the opinion of this committee the changes made since 2006 are significant. For the first time in the SCE’s history the Executive Director’s office and the “working” office are by intention in separate physical locations. In addition, the “working” office is no longer affiliated with an academic institution and the staff of the “working” office is now a direct employee of the SCE. The various changes were in some cases a result of specific decisions and in other cases more organic in nature reflecting growth of membership services and the increased complexity of running an annual meeting that must be coordinated with the Society for Jewish Ethics and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics. Whatever the reasons for the changes, the unintentional and unintended consequences of those changes have created systematic ambiguity about the structure of the Office of Executive Director. While clear and open communication is essential to the smooth operation of any organization, it is difficult to achieve such communication with the type of systemic structural ambiguities the committee has discovered. As a result, both the Executive Director and the Associate Executive Director – through no fault of their own – have been placed in untenable positions. That is, they have been asked to be responsible for the effective and efficient management of the SCE’s business in an organizational structure that is flawed.

II. The Short Term: Four Immediate Recommendations

A. The Committee recommends that the Board institute a program of regular, non-evaluative consultations with the Executive Director, the Associate Executive Director, the Treasurer, and the Co-Editors and that the results of those consultations be reported to the Board.
The purpose of these conversations is to improve communication within the organization by asking questions such as the following. What has been your experience in the position over the past year? What were the positive accomplishments and developments? What was negative? What significant developments and challenges do you anticipate in the coming year and the longer term? How can you be more effectively supported in your work? We believe that, after an appropriate period of time, this practice should be reviewed with an eye toward whether it should be continued, revised, or discontinued. [See Appendix A, The charge to the Committee on the Structure of the SCE, for further details.]

B. The Committee recommends that relevant SCE files, e.g., job descriptions, information on which expenses the SCE covers for different officers and positions, a description of the practice of regular consultations, and selected Board actions, be uploaded to a “cloud” to which the Executive Director, Associate Executive Director, elected officers, and selected others have password access.

The aim here is to facilitate access to important information within the organization by taking advantage of recently available technology.

C. The Committee recommends that persons elected Vice President of the SCE meet with the Board and otherwise be in “the organizational loop” for a four-year cycle rather than (the current) three-year cycle.

This might be done simply by electing people to the position of Vice President for one year, and then having them serve for one year as President Elect, one year as President, and one year as Past President. The aim is to improve the institutional memory of the organization and to furnish more hands-on experience within the organization for presidents before they serve in that office. A four-year cycle has worked well in the American Academy of Religion and the Catholic Theological Society of America; the Society for Business Ethics has found a five-year cycle to be effective.

D. The Committee recommends that each year the Nominating Committee of the SCE be given a clear statement of the responsibilities of the Vice President, the President, and the other officers to be elected. The aim of this recommendation is to better inform Nominating Committee members of the organizational responsibilities of the Vice President and the President.

III. The Long Term: A Recommendation and Some Options

A. The Committee recommends that, during its meeting in January 2014, the Board appoint a Committee to study long-term organizational options for the SCE, and ask this subsequent committee to return with specific recommendations to the Board in January 2015.

B. The present Committee believes that the subsequent committee should consider options such as the following:

1. The current structure might be revised and clarified. If the subsequent committee moves in this direction, we believe that it should make specific recommendations regarding a personnel committee of the Board and regular consultations, as well as clear position descriptions for the Executive Director, Associate Executive Director, Treasurer, and Editors of the Journal. We believe it should be emphasized that the
Executive Director is a position of academic leadership that helps to envision future initiatives, focuses on peer-to-peer relationships and issues, and entails specific duties and responsibilities. We also believe it should be emphasized that the Associate Executive Director position focuses on indispensable administrative and clerical responsibilities. In addition, we believe a complete recommendation will also answer questions such as the following. Does the Associate Executive Director report to the Executive Director? Do both report to the Board? Does the Treasurer report to the Board? Do the Co-Editors report to the Board of the SCE, the Board of the Journal, or both? At Board meetings as well as the Executive Committee meeting that plans the annual program, do the editors each have 1 vote, ½ vote, or simply voice without vote?

2. The SCE might be restructured. For example, we might move toward an organization with a full-time Executive Director who is employed by the SCE and probably is not a member of the Society. Were the SCE to move in this direction, consideration would need to be given to who manages the organization, furnishes academic leadership, and handles peer-to-peer relations, etc. Answers to these questions might well impact the duties and responsibilities of other positions and elected officers.

3. The SCE might outsource many of its administrative functions. This could be done by instituting a relationship with an organization such as the Philosophy Documentation Center in Charlottesville, Virginia that already works with a number of other academic societies, e.g., The Society for Business Ethics. Outsourcing would require appropriate revisions and perhaps also reductions in SCE positions; it might also impact the duties and responsibilities of elected officers.

The Center oversees registration and applications for membership. It prints programs and staffs desks for annual meetings. It does not negotiate with and vet hotels. It does not assign rooms for sessions at annual meetings, and it does not perform treasury functions. The Center, in the person of its Director George Leaman, would consider requests to take on those responsibilities. [See Appendix C: Philosophy Documentation Center.]

C. The Committee urges that, together with any proposed changes in structure, the subsequent committee also indicate an appropriate timetable for implementation of the changes and that such a timetable takes account of the needs and plans of those serving in current positions. We also urge that, as it proceeds, the subsequent committee consult with the current Executive Director, Associate Executive Director, Treasurer, and Co-Editors of the Journal.

Finally, the Committee wishes to thank our current Executive Director and Associate Executive Director for their help in its work.

Respectfully submitted,

M. Cathleen Kaveny
Douglas Ottati (Chair)
Peter Paris
Gina Wolfe
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In August 2013, SCE President Allen Verhey appointed our committee to review long-term organizational options for the Society. Following on the work of a previous Committee on the Structure of the SCE, chaired by Douglas Ottati, our specific charge was to consider long-term needs and possibilities regarding administrative and organizational structures for the Society of Christian Ethics. In our work, we have sought to build on the recommendations of the previous committee. In particular, we endorse their recommendation of a transition to a four-year presidential cycle, and we have assumed that change in this report. Other recommendations by the Committee on the Structure of the SCE seem to us to be useful and appropriate in relation to the implementation of our primary recommendation for a restructuring of the executive and administrative functions of the SCE, and we make note of them below.

Originally, our committee was asked to make recommendations for consideration by the membership at the Annual Business Meeting in 2015. After preliminary discussions in the fall of 2013 and held an extended committee meeting in Seattle that settled the broad outlines of our organizational proposal, it became clear that the Executive Committee would need to begin consideration of these recommendations now, at its spring meeting in 2014, if implementation of any of them were to begin early in 2015. To facilitate that consideration, we are pleased to submit the following report, which we would be happy to interpret or develop further as the Executive Committee may direct.

History
The previous Committee on Structure provided a detailed history of the Society’s organization and administration. For our purposes, that history can be summarized as follows: As the SCE has grown, its administrative needs have been met in a variety of ways. While governance has long been the responsibility of the elected officers and a Board of Directors, an Executive Secretary originally provided organizational continuity and a central office for records and administration. This person, later titled Executive Director (ED), was appointed for a term of office and was always a faculty member who provided professional identity and leadership, as well as organizational administration. Close collaboration between the Executive Director and elected officers provided comprehensive leadership, while the search for and appointment of a new ED as each term expired became one of the most important responsibilities of the elected officers and Board. By the early 1990s, the administrative tasks had grown large enough for the ED to require a part-time assistant, whose responsibilities in turn grew until they comprised a job description of their own. Today, the Associate Executive Director (AED) has a position that requires attention throughout the year and needs the services of a number of assistants and contractors in order to support the Annual Meeting, maintain the organization, and serve the elected officers and Board of Directors. In the past, the ED selected his or her associate(s) and maintained direct contact with the administrative office. More recently, these roles and tasks have developed to the point that the AED now maintains an ongoing administrative office in a different location from the ED, who works primarily from his or her own academic institution.

Options
A key question for the future of the Society of Christian Ethics is whether this model of executive and administrative services, which has evolved over nearly three decades, is adequate to the needs of a growing Society in a changing academic environment. Several areas of concern raise questions for the future.

- The growth of the SCE and the rising expectations of its members now require almost continuous attention to communications and meeting planning.
- The size and complexity of the organization require administrative functions that cannot easily be supervised by a faculty member who has primary professional responsibilities for teaching and research.
- Our collaborations with the Society of Jewish Ethics and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics have significantly increased the organizational tasks associated with the Annual Meeting.
- Fiscal constraints and rising expectations for faculty productivity make it less likely that institutions will be able and willing to support mid-career faculty who take on the responsibilities of the ED by offering course reductions, clerical assistance, and office facilities.

Both the ED and AED have made outstanding contributions in adapting the existing job descriptions to suit the growth of the organization. They have effectively handled the new relationships with the SJE and SSME, provided an Annual Meeting schedule that is responsive to changing needs and interests of our own membership, and successfully orchestrated all the many elements of recent Annual Meetings with a rare combination of professionalism and personal warmth. They have taken important initiatives to compile handbooks of policy and procedure to facilitate future leadership, and they have found ways to maintain administrative continuity as tasks and decisions shuttle between their two offices. We highly applaud the work of both the ED and AED during a period of rapid growth, new institutional relationships, and organizational transition.

Nevertheless, the SCE cannot simply rely on the dedication of its administrative leadership to compensate for structural dysfunctions. Recent experience clearly shows that the current organizational model has reached the limits of its adaptability to the growing requirements of the Society. As the entity legally charged with overseeing the SCE, the Board of Directors is responsible for establishing a sound and accountable organizational structure, with appropriate assessment processes to identify and address problems early in their development. In the remainder of this report, our committee outlines a new approach to the organization of the Society’s administrative functions, but we want to emphasize any restructuring of the administrative offices will also demand revisions to the structure and operations of the Board itself. Its fiduciary duty requires that the governance structure, like the administration, match the size and complexity of the Society.

**Recommendations**

A range of alternative models can be found among other academic and professional societies. The largest of these organizations can maintain permanent offices with multiple staff positions and fulltime executive posts that offer long-term career options for a scholar who seeks that kind of leadership in the profession. The SCE does not have the resources to support that model at present and is not likely to reach that level in the near future. At the other end of the scale in size and complexity, highly differentiated academic fields, such as philosophy, have generated umbrella organizations that provide administrative services for a number of smaller, specialized academic and professional societies. The SCE might find a home under one of those roofs, or we might make use of a variety of businesses that provide comprehensive services for annual meetings, publications, and membership records. While such “outsourcing” might be considered at a future date, we believe this is not the appropriate time, particularly in light of our collaborations with the
SJE and SSME. Most important, the SCE currently provides a combination of administrative efficiency and personal attention that most of our members find very satisfying. The objective of any organizational changes must be to maintain the distinctive character of the SCE and the sensitivity to our members' needs, commitments, and institutional settings that has characterized our leadership through our history.

To provide for continued quality administrative leadership as the Society grows and changes, we recommend that the offices of ED and AED be restructured and consolidated in a single position which we shall, for present purposes, call the office of Administrative Director (AD). We stress that as we conceive it, this position is not a simple continuation of either of the existing offices, but combines some features of both of them.

The AD should be a full-time administrative professional, provided by the Society with a salary commensurate to experience and responsibilities, adequate office facilities, and support personnel and services appropriate to the tasks of the office. Those tasks include support for the Society’s elected officers and Board of Directors, liaison with the SJE and SSME, administration of the Society’s finances in cooperation with the elected Treasurer, support for the editors of the *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*, administration of membership records and dues collection, management of communications with the membership, website management, and administrative oversight, preparation, and support for the Annual Meeting, the Annual Business Meeting, and other meetings as directed by the Board of Directors and elected officers. (Meeting management might in the future include selection and management of virtual meeting software.)

Appointment of an AD should be the decision of the President, based on the recommendation of a search committee and confirmed by the Board of Directors. The AD’s relationship to the Society should be contractual, subject to regular performance reviews, and without a fixed term of service. That is, we believe that the future needs of the SCE will be best served by single professional administrator who works in close cooperation with and is fully accountable to the Society’s elected leadership, and who has the opportunity to provide continuity of leadership and build a long-term career in this position. We thus do not suppose that the AD will be a scholar with career commitments to teaching and research, though administrative experience working with scholars and teachers in an academic setting is an obvious asset.

While this administrative consolidation is our most important recommendation for the Society’s future, implementation of the AD position would require adjustments in other organizational arrangements, and changes both in the SCE and in the wider world of religion, society, and higher education suggest other changes in the Society’s structure and division of responsibilities. For example:

- The new office of AD will require both autonomy and accountability. While the AD will need considerable freedom to make plans and respond to events on a daily basis, the Board of Directors must be organized to provide regular reviews of administrative performance that ensure fiscal transparency and conformity to the Society’s policies and values. Responsibility for this oversight cannot be diffused among the Board and elected officers as a whole. An integral part of the plan of organization we propose here will be changes in the By-laws that create a specific committee to conduct these reviews and place a designated officer in charge of them.

- The changing world of higher education means that our members will increasingly rely on the SCE for advice and advocacy as they deal with the changing world of academic careers and professional responsibilities. The work of the Twenty-First Century committee needs to be continued and perhaps given an ongoing organizational presence. The four-year presidential cycle that is currently under consideration for adoption at the 2015 Annual Meeting seems to us an important step in providing the continuity of leadership
and experience that this important work requires. The four-year presidential cycle also provides opportunities to spread the important and growing responsibility for representing the SCE in other academic and professional settings.

- Effective administrative leadership is no substitute for experienced, informed leadership by the Board and elected officers. The AD will have responsibility for implementing the will and purposes of the Society, but the will and purposes must be determined and articulated by the officers and Board of Directors. We believe that there are significant structural weaknesses in the schedule of Board meetings, the efficiency of those meetings, and the preparation of Board members for conducting the business of the Society at its annual meeting. We strongly recommend that a comprehensive the Board’s committee structure and meeting schedule be undertaken, with a view to determining changes that may be needed due to the size and complexity of the organization, the demands on our financial resources, and the ongoing need for clear and cogent policies and procedures for our own operations and our relationships with the SJE and SSME. As a part of this review, and with special attention to the transition to a four year presidential cycle, the responsibilities of the various officers should also be reviewed, clarified, and restructured as necessary.

**Implementation**

Our committee offers this report not as a blueprint, but as a suggestion for further development. It reflects our long experience in the SCE and in other positions of academic and administrative leadership, but we submit this proposal to the Executive Committee knowing that if the main lines are accepted, it will require a good deal of further work, and its implementation will be phased and gradual. In particular, the terms and commitments of our agreements with the present ED and AED need to be respected, and we should make the best possible use of their wisdom, experience, and service to the Society as we plan for the future. We hope that submission of this brief report for wider consideration by the Board and officers at this time will facilitate preparation for decisions at the Annual Meeting in 2015 and beyond. We thank you for the opportunity you have given us to think about the future of an organization that has meant much to each of us, and we are eager to work with you as you may request in developing these suggestions.

Robin Lovin, Chair
Peter Paris
Regina Wentzel Wolfe
Diane Yeager
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REPORT OF THE SOCIETY OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS
ORGANIZATIONAL OPTIONS COMMITTEE (2014)

SUMMARY

To provide effective leadership and administration for our large and complex Society in today’s institutional environment, the committee recommends measures to strengthen the executive roles of the Board of Directors and elected officers, including a four-year presidential cycle and the creation of a standing Personnel Committee in the Board. We also recommend that administrative tasks be consolidated in the office of a single Administrative Director and that work now underway to document the Society’s policies and operating procedures be continued as a high priority.

In its fifty-six years, the Society of Christian Ethics has grown from a group of scholars who could meet around a table in a seminary classroom to an organization with hundreds of members, a Journal published twice yearly, a large annual meeting coordinated with the work of the SJE and SSME, a Pacific Coast Section, international relations to the SSCE and Societas Ethica, and an ongoing study project on the future of the profession. Leadership and administrative structures have developed with time, too, from a few volunteer officers elected by the membership to today’s system, which includes a three-year cycle of elected presidential leadership, an elected Board of Directors, and an Executive Director and Associate Executive Director who provide ongoing guidance and administrative services for the Society. Significant executive responsibilities are also assigned to the Co-Editors of the JSCE and the appointed Treasurer and Archivist.

These offices have been filled with great ability and real commitment to the future of the Society. Our Executive Directors have provided outstanding organizational leadership and exemplified the academic virtues of our profession. The Associate Executive Director has responded effectively to growing administrative needs, and the tasks undertaken in that office have become essential to our organizational effectiveness.

The scope and variety of these offices and institutional arrangements is, however, a reminder of the importance of strategic direction, coordinated leadership, and administrative oversight from the elected leadership of the Society. It is these officers who have fiduciary responsibility, in law and in practice, for the work and resources of the Society.

In the existing model, which dates back more than twenty years, these responsibilities have largely devolved to the Executive Director, who is also a scholar with an academic appointment and responsibilities for teaching and research. The administration of the Society was at first included in the job of the Executive Director, though from the 1990s many administrative tasks have been carried out by an assistant, and lately by an Associate Executive Director, and this has grown to be, for all practical purposes, a full-time managerial position. The growing workload of the
Associate Executive Director is one measure of the Society’s size and complexity. Other important changes are signaled by the fact that no Executive Director in recent decades has sought appointment to a second term in the position. In the changing institutional environment in higher education, there is also decline in the readiness of schools and departments to support a faculty member’s service to professional societies like ours with released time, support staff, and office facilities.

Our committee and predecessor committees have considered a variety of organizational options to address these changing conditions. These included revisions to the existing administrative structure, more extensive outsourcing of specific administrative functions, outsourcing the entire administrative task to the Philosophy Documentation Center (or another organization that provides administrative services to academic groups), and expanding the existing position of Executive Director into a full-time, career position for a member of the profession. All of these alternatives seemed in various ways either inadequate to the size and complexity of our Society or beyond the resources we have for the foreseeable future. We conclude that the most realistic, practical and efficient solution is to strengthen the executive role of the elected leadership while consolidating administrative functions in a single office with a full-time employee.

To meet our organizational needs for the future, we propose 1) a change in both the structure and the culture of the Society that concentrates executive leadership in the elected presidential leadership and the Board of Directors. We also propose 2) a phasing out of the positions of Executive Director and Associate Executive Director, and 3) consolidation of administrative functions in a single office of Administrative Director, who would be a full-time employee of the Society, provided with working space, support services, and appropriate structures and procedures for supervision and evaluation. The transition to this new model is itself a complex executive and administrative task, and we recommend 4) that it be carried out with appropriate care to document the existing policies and procedures of the Society and to provide for organizational continuity through future changes in personnel.

Executive Leadership

Election to the Presidency of the Society is a high honor and a collegial recognition of scholarly achievement. It also requires a growing measure of executive leadership. This is already recognized in the three-year presidential cycle by which the Vice President automatically succeeds to the Presidency and the immediate Past President serves an additional year as a member of the Board. The Board of Directors has proposed to strengthen this executive structure by the addition of the new position of President Elect. This would provide continuity in leadership across four years and share the demands of executive direction among several experienced and highly qualified members of the Society and the profession. Our committee endorses this proposal and has incorporated it into our recommendations. We add only the specific recommendation that provisions be made in the Bylaws for filling these offices or reassigning their functions in the event of a vacancy. Collaboration among the four members of the presidential cycle under the direction of the current President would be essential, but basic on-going responsibilities could be assigned to each office. For example, the President Elect could be in charge of the Annual Meeting and its program and might also meet with the Nominating Committee to review key administrative responsibilities of the elected Board and officers of the Society. The Vice President could provide liaison with the officers of affiliated societies and attend the Pacific Coast Section meeting. The Past President could oversee the orientation of newly elected officers and participate in site visits to future Annual Meeting venues.
The Bylaws also assign executive leadership to the appointed positions of Treasurer, Archivist, and Editor(s) of the *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*. We do not see a need for major structural changes in the duties of these positions or in the ways that appointments to them are made. We recommend that the Treasurer also assume the duties of the corporate Secretary for legal purposes and that the office be renamed Secretary-Treasurer. (These duties primarily concern legal reporting requirements for which the Treasurer already has some responsibility under the Bylaws and do not involve the duties of a recording secretary at meetings.)

The elected Board of Directors has an important role to play in executive leadership. Its existing functions should be augmented by the addition of a standing Personnel Committee, which would be responsible for the hiring, general supervision, and evaluation of employees of the Society, including most particularly the Administrative Director proposed below.

Structural changes alone will not ensure the success of this new model of executive leadership. It is important that those who hold fiduciary responsibility for the Society on behalf of its membership understand and accept that responsibility, in addition to the academic leadership and representative roles that the President and members of the Board are expected to provide. We encourage the President and the Board of Directors not only to take action to implement the structural changes proposed in this report, but also to reflect on the implications of those changes for the nominating process, orientation of newly elected officers and Board members to their tasks, the schedule and length of Board meetings, and possible needs for additional meetings of the presidential leadership, the Executive Committee, and the Personnel Committee.

**Administrative Leadership**

Administration of the Society is a complex task involving membership records, a large annual meeting shared with two affiliated societies, record-keeping for corporate reporting and financial accountability, and support services for Presidential officers, the Board of Directors, and other meetings, among other things. We believe that these needs can be most efficiently met if they are consolidated in a single administrative office, which we here call the Administrative Director. The many services that would be the responsibility of this office are of several types, including:

- Record keeping, which includes membership rolls, income and expenditure information, and official minutes.
- Communications, including the Society website and member mailings.
- Meeting planning, both for the Annual Meeting and for the Board, Program Committee, and other special meetings.
- Support services for executive leadership in preparation of agendas, official communications, and relationships with affiliated societies.
- Documentation of Society policies and procedures to provide transparency, accountability, and continuity over time and through changes in personnel.

The Administrative Director should be an experienced, professional administrator or manager. Under present circumstances, the Administrative Director would be a full-time position and would need the support of additional part-time personnel or contract services in connection with the annual meeting and some other communications and record-keeping functions. We would not expect that the Administrative Director would be a member of the Society or hold an academic appointment.
The Administrative Director would be appointed by the Board of Directors upon recommendation of the Personnel Committee, and would serve under terms agreed upon prior to appointment, the terms themselves being part of the Personnel Committee’s recommendation. There need be no fixed limit on the length of this appointment, though performance would be subject to regular review. In short, the Administrative Director is an employee of the Society, with the rights and obligations of an employee, in contrast to executive leadership who are members of the Society holding office for limited terms by election or appointment.

**Transition**

The structural changes we have proposed should comprehensively relocate the current responsibilities of the Executive Director and Associate Executive Director either in the strengthened executive leadership of the elected officers and Board or in the consolidative administrative office of the Administrative Director. The transition to this new structure is important and may take some time. We strongly recommend that the current Executive Director and Associate Executive Director be invited to remain in their positions during the transition to work closely with the Presidential leadership and the Board of Directors to develop the new structure and assure that all existing executive and administrative functions are accounted for in the new plan. While the appointment of the current Executive Director ends in 2016, we note that the existing Bylaws do not specify a term of office for the Executive Director, and we see no obstacle to a Board appointment that would extend her term for whatever transition period might be mutually agreed. The current Associate Executive Director has no term, so that the question becomes one of establishing a mutually agreeable date on which the current position would end and the new Administrative Director position would be available to be filled.

One part of the transition to a new culture of executive leadership in the Board of Directors is a re-examination of their own ways of working in more detail than can be provided here. We strongly recommend that during the transition period, the Board hold an extended retreat, possibly with the help of an outside consultant, to consider the new allocation of executive responsibilities, review existing policies and procedures, and compare best practices in comparable scholarly organizations.

Another transition responsibility involves communication about these changes with the membership of the Society at large. Their approval will be needed for the important structural changes, and new ways of understanding leadership in the Society must be widely shared among the members, many of whom will be called upon in the future to fill these elected positions.

During the transition period, the Executive Director will have an important role in helping the Board and Presidential leadership to identify and assume their expanded leadership roles. Both the Executive Director and the Associate Executive Director will need to work closely with the Presidential leadership and the Board to establish new personnel structures, identify key administrative and executive tasks, and document SCE policies and procedures for future reference.

While most elements of the transition can be managed effectively by cooperation among the parties involved, some of the structural changes require amendments to the Bylaws. While we make no claims to having reviewed the Bylaws comprehensively, we attach as an appendix some suggestions as to the most important changes our report implies.
Our committee concludes its work with renewed appreciation for the record of growth and innovation that has marked the history of our Society and with great appreciation for the leadership that has brought us to this point in our development. We stand ready to discuss our report and its implementation in any way that would be helpful.

THE SCE ORGANIZATIONAL OPTIONS COMMITTEE (2014)
Robin Lovin, chair
Douglas Ottati
Peter Paris
Gina Wolfe

MEMO

To: The Members of the Board of Directors - Society of Christian Ethics

From: Cathy Kaveny
Bill Schweiker

Date: May 16, 2014

Re: SCE Structure

As we discussed at our Board meeting in Seattle, the Society of Christian Ethics is at a crucial point in its history. In a sense, we are victims of our own success: our organizational structures and manner of proceeding have not kept up with the growth of the SCE, either with respect to the number of members or with respect to the range of activities in which we are engaged.

Over the past couple of years, SCE leadership has been grappling with situation. More specifically, there has been a series of three committees appointed by the President and charged with evaluating our organizational situation and suggesting changes designed to improve accountability and facilitate better functionality, given the exponential growth of the Society. Two of the three committees have finished their work and issued reports; the third committee is now hard at work.

It appears likely that in order to fulfill our fiduciary obligations as members of the SCE Board of Directors, we will need to deliberate about and make some decisions about the SCE’s organizational structure during this summer.

Let us highlight up front the two practical implications for your schedules:

1. It is highly likely that the Board will need to meet at least once by SKYPE or conference call this summer (mid July - mid August) in order to discuss, deliberate upon, and finalize recommended changes to the bylaws, so that they can be distributed to the membership at large in the fall mailing.

2. The Board will be meeting for a full day (not a half day), on Thursday, January 8, 2015.

In this memo, we would like to provide all members of the Board with a complete picture of the situation, so that everyone has the materials necessary to consider the issues that will require attention and decision. In part I of the memo, we summarize the recent history of the SCE’s
consideration of its structure, which is marked by the creation of three successive committees. In part II, we indicate the tasks and issues likely to face the Board in the next eight months. We also attach the reports of the two committees that have completed their work.

I. History

A. The Ottati Committee

In January 2013, SCE President Allen Verhey appointed an Organizational Structure Committee chaired by Doug Ottati, and including Cathy Kaveny, Peter Paris and Gina Wolfe as members (the “Ottati Committee”). That committee investigated the history of the organizational structure of the SCE and made five recommendations in its report delivered to the President in April 2013:

1. The Board should institute a program of regular, non-evaluative consultations with the Executive Director, Associate Executive Director, the Treasurer, and the Co-Editors, and the result of those consultations be reported to the Board.
   *This program was instituted before the January 2014 Board Meeting.*

2. The relevant SCE organizational files should be uploaded to a “cloud” to which the Executive Director, Associate Executive Director, elected officers, and selected others would have password access.
   *This recommendation has not yet been implemented.*

3. The SCE should institute a four-year presidential cycle, adding the office of President Elect to the current three-year cycle.
   *See recommendation 5 below.*

4. The Nominating Committee should be better informed of the organizational responsibilities of the officers to be elected.
   *This recommendation has begun to be implemented; a statement along those lines was given to the chair of the Nominating Committee in January 2014.*

5. The President should appoint a new Committee to study the long-term organizational options for the SCE, and bring to the Board specific recommendations for updating the organizational structure.
   *In August 2013, President Verhey appointed a committee chaired by Robin Lovin—see below.*

B. The Lovin I Committee

In accordance with the recommendation of the Ottati Committee, President Verhey appointed a committee chaired by Robin Lovin and consisting of Peter Paris, Gina Wolfe, and Diane Yeager (the “Lovin I Committee”). While originally asked to deliver its report at the Business Meeting in January 2015, the committee graciously agreed to advance its time line when it became clear that doing so was necessary if implementation were to begin in 2015.

The Lovin I Committee submitted to the President (Cathy Kaveny) a preliminary report in March 2014, which concluded that there were serious “structural dysfunctions” in the SCE’s organizational operations. More specifically, the Lovin I Committee maintained that the SCE’s current structure is no longer practically feasible, given the growth of the SCE, and the new demands of modern academia. Moreover, the current structure seriously impedes the ability of the Officers and the Board to exercise their corporate fiduciary duties. Consequently, the Lovin I Committee made two fundamental recommendations:
1. The offices of Executive Director and Associate Executive Director be combined into a single, full-time position of Administrative Director without a fixed term of service, and with an appropriate balance of autonomy and accountability.

2. It is not only necessary for the SCE to transition to a four-year presidential cycle, it is also essential to subject the structure and operations of the Officers and the Board to a comprehensive, critical review, in light of the “size and complexity of the Society.”

Cathy Kaveny shared the Lovin I Committee Report with the Executive Committee at its spring meeting in St. Louis in March 2014. The members of the Executive Committee agreed with the Report’s recommendations, and affirmed the need to act quickly, for the following reasons:

1. The term of the current Executive Director, Stacey Floyd-Thomas, ends in July 2016; she has already indicated that she does not wish to be considered for a second term.

2. Consequently, the new structure for the SCE needs to be fully operational by July 2016. Working backward, we find:
   a. The four-year presidential cycle needs to be elected and put in place at the January 2016 Annual Meeting.
   b. Bill Schweiker, who will assume the presidency in January 2015, will need to appoint a Nominations Committee in January 2015, which will transition to that four-year cycle. More specifically, that Nominations Committee will be charged with finding candidates not only for the office of vice-president, but also for the new office of president-elect. (This will be a one-year only task; in subsequent years the SCE will elect a new vice-president, and the current vice president will transition to president-elect).
   c. The SCE membership needs to approve a set of revised bylaws, which include the four-year presidential cycle, no later than January 2015.
   d. The proposed revisions to the bylaws need to be sent to the membership at large with the call to meeting in late August, 2014, in order to comply with article XI of the bylaws.
   e. Before sending the proposed revisions to the membership, the Board needs to discuss the revisions and take a consultative vote, in order to comply with article XI of the bylaws.4
   f. The proposed revisions need to be distributed to the Board by [July 15], so that a meeting can be arranged by Skype to discuss and vote on them.

C. The Lovin II Committee

4 Article XI: “These By-Laws may be amended by vote of the majority of the members present and voting at the Annual Meeting, the Call to Meeting shall contain notice of any proposed amendment, and shall include a copy or summary of the amendment and state the general nature of the amendment. The Board of Directors shall discuss the proposed amendment at a meeting of the Board prior to the Annual Meeting, and shall take a consultative vote regarding whether it should be adopted, the results of which vote shall be presented by the President or the Executive Director to the membership at the Annual Meeting prior to the vote of the members regarding the proposed amendment.”
In order to meet the demands of this time line, and with the support of the Executive Committee, Cathy Kaveny appointed a new committee, to focus upon specific changes to the SCE’s structure. This committee will be charged with implementing the recommendations of the Lovin I Committee, in light of the recommendations and findings of the Ottati Committee. Given the time pressures, Kaveny thought it made sense to include on this new committee the chairs of the previous committees (Robin Lovin and Doug Ottati) and the two persons who had served on both committees (Peter Paris and Gina Wolfe). She asked Robin Lovin to chair this new committee (the Lovin II Committee).

The charge to the Lovin II Committee was twofold:

1. **Bylaw Changes**

   The Committee was asked to review and revise the SCE Bylaws, and propose specific changes that would implement key changes recommended by the Lovin I Committee: a) the shift to a four-year presidential cycle; b) the shift from an Executive Director/Associate Executive Director framework to an Administrative Director Framework; and c) the increased responsibilities of the Board (e.g., two meetings a year).

2. **A Policy Memo**

   The Committee was asked to write a memo fleshing out how the think the various responsibilities of the various offices should be distributed, and any other duties revised or expanded, in order to achieve the goals of the Lovin I Committee Report, and address the concerns identified in the Ottati Committee Report. In order to facilitate this task, we asked our Executive Director, Stacey Floyd-Thomas, and our Associate Executive Director, Linda Schreiber, to submit written reflections about structural issues that they believe the Committee should keep in mind.

   We asked the Lovin II Committee to submit its report by July 1. This will give us time to share the report with the Executive Committee for initial feedback, and then to submit the full Board for review and discussion no later than July 10.

**Conclusion**

We deeply appreciate your commitment to the well-being of the Society of Christian Ethics. We realize that summer is a busy time, dedicated to both sustained academic work and to nurturing relationships with family and friends. At the same time, we trust that you will find the time to read this memo and its attachments as background now, and to seriously consider the proposals of the Lovin II Committee when they arrive on your desks halfway through the summer.

**Appendix: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO BYLAWS**

*Amendments to the Bylaws required to implement the structural changes in the Organizational Options Committee (2014) report will need to be phased in as part of a comprehensive*
transition plan. The amendments to Article V creating the four-year Presidential cycle and the Personnel Committee could be enacted and implemented as soon as possible in accordance with proposals already approved by the Board of Directors and the procedures for amendments specified in the current Article XI. The new Article VI creating the office of Administrative Director could not, of course, be implemented until the transition process is complete. It might be possible, however, to enact these amendments with enabling legislation setting a later date at which they would become effective.

The following are the essential revisions to the Bylaws that our recommendations would require:

In Article V, preface and Sections 1-2, replace with the following Sections 1-4, and renumber following sections accordingly. The language proposed here incorporates proposed amendments as approved by the Board of Directors, which are underlined.

ARTICLE V

Officers

The Officers of the Society are the President, the President Elect, the Vice President, the Past President, and the Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 1. President

The President shall serve for a term of one year commencing with the adjournment of the Annual Business Meeting of the Society, and shall be selected in accordance with the procedure described in Article V, Section 2. The President shall preside at the Annual Meeting and at the meetings of the Board of Directors, and shall receive, together with the Board, reports from the Executive Director and shall have and exercise such other powers and duties as may be prescribed by the Board. The President shall customarily deliver a "Presidential Address" to the membership at the Annual Meeting.

After serving out the term, the retiring President shall automatically become Past President and serve as a member of the Board of Directors for a one-year term.

Section 2. President Elect

The President Elect shall serve for a term of one year commencing with the adjournment of the Annual Business Meeting of the Society, and shall be selected in accordance with the procedure described in Article V, Section 2. The President Elect shall automatically succeed to the presidency. The President Elect shall be present at the Annual Meeting and at the meetings of the Board of Directors, and shall receive, together with the Board, reports from the Executive Director and shall have and exercise such other powers and duties as may be prescribed by the Board. In the event of the resignation, death, or incapacity of the President, the President Elect shall serve as acting President of the Society, and shall perform such presidential duties as the Board of Directors deems appropriate.

Section 3. Vice President
The Vice President shall serve for a term of one year commencing with the adjournment of the Annual Business Meeting of the Society. The Vice President shall be elected by a majority vote of members present and voting at the Annual Meeting of the Society. The Vice President shall automatically succeed to the Presidency elect. The Vice President shall be present at the Annual Meeting and at the meetings of the Board of Directors, and shall receive, together with the Board, reports from the Executive Director and shall have and exercise such other powers and duties as may be prescribed by the Board. In the event of the resignation, death, or incapacity of the President Elect, the Vice President shall automatically serve as the President Elect of the Society, and shall perform such duties as the Board of Directors deems appropriate. In the event that President Elect resigns or is unable to complete her or his term, the Vice President shall succeed to that Office, and at the following Annual Meeting the members present and voting shall elect both a Vice President and a President Elect.

Section 4. Past President

After serving out the term, the retiring President shall automatically become Past President and serve as a member of the Board of Directors for a one-year term. In the event that the Past President resigns or is unable to complete her or his term, the Office shall remain vacant until the current President succeeds to it at the end of her or his one-year presidential term, and such duties as the Past President was to perform will be assigned to other officers by the President.

In Article V, delete current Section 3, Executive Director/Secretary and delete or adjust all other references to this office throughout the document.

In Article V, current Section 4, change the name of the office to Secretary-Treasurer. By implication, this makes the Secretary-Treasurer the Secretary of the Society for legal purposes.

Create and insert a new Article VI and renumber following articles accordingly.

Article VI

Administrative Director

Section 1. Appointment

The Board of Directors shall appoint an Administrative Director of the Society, on recommendation of the Personnel Committee. The Administrative Director shall be an employee of the Society, under terms agreed with the Personnel Committee, which terms shall be consistent with these Bylaws and shall be incorporated into the Personnel Committee recommendation of the appointment to the Board of Directors. The Administrative Director shall report to the Personnel Committee, which will be responsible for an annual review and evaluation.

Section 2. Duties

The Administrative Director shall have responsibility for preparing the minutes of meetings of the Board of Directors and of the Members, shall give or cause to be given notices of all such
meetings, shall authenticate records of the Society, and shall see that records and reports are properly kept and filed by the Society.

The Administrative Director, in consultation and cooperation with the Board of Directors, the Executive Committee, and the Program Committee, shall coordinate the planning and execution of the Annual Meeting and all activities associated with it, including but not limited to the selection of meeting sites, the production of the Annual Meeting Program, and the provision of materials and facilities needed at the Annual Meeting. The Administrative Director shall advise the Executive Committee on items of business which require its attention. The Administrative Director shall have such other duties and powers as designated by the Board of Directors.

Revisions may be appropriate in current Article VIII, Section 1. Nominating Committee, and Section 2. Program Committee, according as various responsibilities are assigned to the Vice President and President Elect in the presidential leadership cycle. To maintain flexibility for future leadership, it may be advisable to assign these duties and the related committee memberships by Board action, under the “such duties as may be prescribed by the Board” clauses, rather than incorporating them into the Bylaws.

Create and insert a new Section 3 in current Article VIII and renumber current section 3 accordingly.

Section 3. Personnel Committee

The Personnel Committee provides oversight and support for the Society’s employees and makes recommendations to the Board of Directors concerning appointment of the Administrative Director (see Article VI). The Personnel Committee shall consist of the President, the President Elect, and two members of the Board of Directors, one of whom shall serve as chair.

The current Article VIII, Section 3 authorizes the Board to create new committees as necessary. The Board of Directors may, therefore, in implementing the changes recommended in this report, establish a Personnel Committee at any time and assign to it the functions proposed. Our recommendation that provisions for a Personnel Committee be added to the Bylaws is designed to recognize the importance of its work and to ensure its continuation in the future.

*****

MEMO

September 8, 2014
To: Members of the Board of the Society of Christian Ethics
From: Cathy Kaveny
       Bill Schweiker
Re: Urgent SCE Matters

---------------------------------------------------------------
Greetings! We hope you have had a wonderful summer, and that your transition to the demands of a new school year is energizing and painless.

We are writing to let you know of a few SCE matters that need your immediate attention.

I. Change of Meeting Location

As you know, the Renaissance Hotel in St. Louis recently informed the SCE that despite their contractual obligations to us, they would be unable to host our January 2015 meeting, because of planned renovations to the facilities. As the attached memo details, our Executive Director and Associate Executive Director considered a variety of alternatives in St. Louis and elsewhere. Unfortunately, no other available hotel in St. Louis was adequate to the needs of our meeting, which include a large number of breakout rooms, and sufficient restaurants within walking distance.

The Palmer House in Chicago, however, is able to meet all of our needs, as well as those of the Society of Jewish Ethics for its Orthodox members. Moreover, we believe the cost to the members will be the same or even slightly less than they would have been in St. Louis. We believe this shift in location is the best possible outcome for the membership as a whole, all things considered. Yet it is not without its liabilities. We recognize, for example, that some concurrent sessions, some interest group sessions, and some pre-meeting gatherings have been planned around the St. Louis location. We are very sorry to disrupt these plans, and would like to do everything we can to facilitate those meetings given the change in the conference city.

We fully recognize the importance of recent events in St. Louis in our nation’s ongoing conversation about race, police, and the exercise of governmental power. At the same time, we also want to make it clear that our decision to move the conference to Chicago was in no way precipitated by these events; it was based purely on our fiduciary obligations to find a workable hotel for our conference. The Renaissance communicated its decision to us before the shooting of Michael Brown occurred. If we could have found an available hotel that was suitable for our needs, we would have stayed in St. Louis. At this late date, however, this was not a possibility.

We understand that a few members of the Societies have already purchased plane tickets to St. Louis. In some cases, the lower ticket price to Chicago may cancel out the change fee. For those who are still personally disadvantaged because they bought tickets to St. Louis, we will do our best to help them recover the difference.

While the decision about meeting sites falls within the provenance of the Executive Director and the Associate Executive Director, we wanted to make sure that the Board understood the reasoning behind the shift in location. Let me also say how grateful we should all be to Linda and Stacey for their clear-headed resourcefulness in dealing with such a difficult situation.

II. SCE Bylaws and Restructuring

As you know, the SCE has been grappling for some time now with the logistical problems caused by our success: The problem in a nutshell is that our organizational structure, settled upon decades ago, is no longer sufficient to responsibly run a society of our size, complexity, and ambitions. We outlined the history the SCE’s attempt to come to terms with this situation in an email communication to the Board dated May 19, 2014, along with its accompanying attachments. We also indicated that a committee, chaired by Robin Lovin and including members Doug Ottati, Peter
Paris, and Gina Wolfe, would be meeting over the summer, with the charge of producing a report outlining the practical steps the SCE needs to take in order to address its new organizational challenges.

That committee (the “Lovin II Committee”) has returned its Report, which is attached to this memo. The Report makes three key recommendations, which are summarized below, along with the responses that have been taken and that we propose to take in the coming months.

**Recommendation 1**

The structure of the officers of the SCE needs to be revised to move from a three-year to a four-year officer cycle, consisting of Vice President, President Elect, President, and Past President.

**Response to Recommendation 1**

- The Board has already approved this change in structure, and the bylaws necessary to implement them. The Lovin II Committee, however, suggested some useful amendments to those bylaws, which are highlighted on the appropriate attachment. Consequently I am asking the Board to take another vote to approve the proposed bylaws with the Lovin II Committee’s amendments, so that we can include them with the fall mailing. This process will allow the full membership to vote on them in January 2015. *We will take the vote by a separate survey monkey process in the next few days.*

- Assuming the membership approves the proposed bylaws, the four-step officer cycle will begin to be constituted next year. The 2015 Nominating Committee, which will be appointed by Bill Schweiker, will be charged with coming up with a slate of nominees for President Elect as well as for Vice President. Both positions will be filled in January 2016. In subsequent years, it will again be necessary only to nominate candidates for Vice President, since each officer already in place will rotate according to the four-step plan.

**Recommendation 2**

The Board of Directors must cultivate a more active and accountable culture, in recognition of the fact that it is legally and morally responsible for running the SCE. The Report recommends a Board retreat to clarify responsibilities, at least two regular meetings a year, and clarified lines of responsibility. In addition, it recommends the creation of a Personnel Committee to oversee the compensation and performance of those who work for the SCE.

**Recommendation 3**

The SCE should eliminate the part-time position of Executive Director and the position of Associate Executive Director, and transition to a full-time Administrative Director. The Administrative Director will be a full-time professional administrator, not a member of the SCE. It can responsibly make this move, however, only after the new officer and Board culture is fully in place and operational. The Report recognizes that the transition to the new structure will take time, and strongly recommends the current Executive Director and Associate Executive Director to remain in their positions to assist the SCE during this time of transition.

**Response to Recommendations 2 and 3**
• We strongly agree with the Report’s assessment of the situation. We also think that this transition must be done in a step-by-step way, with focused attention. We also agree that the contributions of our Executive Director and Associate Executive Director are essential not only to insuring a successful transition, but also to maintaining the ongoing work of the SCE during this time of transition.

• We have affirmed Stacey Floyd-Thomas in her exercise of the full scope of Executive Directorship during the remaining years of her office. During this time of transition, she will especially focus on working with the officers and the Board in developing and articulating a revised and expanded understanding of their roles and responsibilities. A key aspect of her task will be to encourage the officers, and Board, collectively, to envision the future for the SCE, in light of the work of the 2020 committee and the projected state of the academy and our field. We believe that this focus will allow the SCE to make full use of Stacey’s own considerable knowledge base as a member of the academic guild herself, as well as a gifted facilitator. She has significant experience in analogous visioning projects in both the academy and in the church, and extensive contacts that we may wish to draw upon for advice or inspiration in implementing the Lovin II report.

• We are confident that the day-to-day operations of the SCE will be in excellent hands. No one is more familiar with the workings of the SCE than Linda; her dedication, contributions and wisdom will be essential if the SCE’s work is to continue uninterrupted during this time of transition.

• Timeline

  • Fall 2014 to January 2015

    Working with Bill and Cathy in the fall of 2014, Stacey will take a leadership role in organizing a full-day Board meeting on Thursday, January 8, that will facilitate big-picture visioning on the part of the officers and the Board.

  • May/June 2015

    Working with Bill and his successor, with assistance from Cathy, Stacey will plan the substance of a retreat for the full Board, with outside facilitation. The purpose of the retreat will be to develop a better sense of the nature of the responsibilities of the SCE officers, and to streamline and coordinate the various committees of the Board.

    The timing of this retreat is crucial, because it will give necessary guidance to the Nominating Committee appointed by Bill, which will need to develop a slate of candidates for the four-step presidential cycle in time for the 2016 business meeting.

    The Board will also work out in theory a two-meeting a year schedule, which will go into operation in 2016.

  • January 2016

    The four-year presidential cycle goes into operation.
Stacey begins working with officers and Board members to insure appropriate distribution of responsibility.

Linda organizes and implements the two-Board meeting a year schedule, in addition to overseeing the logistics of the annual meeting.

- 2016

The incoming President (Bill’s successor) works with the officers and the Board to consider the exact nature of the new administrative structure, as well as the timing of its implementation.

Stacey’s term as Executive Director comes to an end in July 2016. Over the course of the preceding year, the officers will have been in conversations with her about the best way to respond to this event in light of the ongoing process of restructuring. One possibility would be to ask her to extend her term for a year or two, until the SCE’s four-year-officer cycle is fully absorbed and enculturated.

### III. Full-Day Board Meeting

As you know, the Board agreed to extend the first session of its meeting to encompass a full-day. Please plan on arriving in Chicago on the evening of Wednesday, January 8; we will have a reception around 8:00 p.m. so that Board members can chat in a more informal setting before getting down to work on Thursday, January 9. We will all be working to plan the substance of a meeting that advances our organizational restructuring and, even more importantly, fosters the essential conversations about the substantive visions that should guide the SCE’s work in the years to come. As many of you know, our half-day meetings left us too little time for those important conversations!
## Governance Appendix A.6: Membership and Registration Statistics

### Membership and Registration Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refundable</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$113</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$122</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$129-139</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$109-159</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrefundable</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$115-125</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Mmbr</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$195/$135</td>
<td>$210/$150</td>
<td>$255/$145</td>
<td>$220/$120</td>
<td>$220/$120</td>
<td>$225/$135</td>
<td>$225/$115</td>
<td>$225/$115</td>
<td>$225/$115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Attendees      | SCE Full        | 326           | 332             | 340             | 415              | 403                 | 330                | 251             | 337             | 40              | 40              |
|                | SCE Contingent  | 48            | 70              | 73              | 83               | 62                  | 89                 | 109             | 94              | 60              | 97              |
|                | SCE Student     | 18            | 19              | 26              | 23               | 34                  | 49                 | 59              | 55              | 65              | 61              |
|                | SJE/SSME        | 18            | 19              | 26              | 23               | 34                  | 49                 | 59              | 55              | 65              | 58              |
|                | Other* Cancellations Total | 76        | 61              | 83              | 68               | 57                  | 71                 | 85              | 76              | 45              | 58              |
|                | Total           | 468           | 482             | 531             | 589             | 454                 | 657                | 656             | 555             | 461             | 593             |

| Publishers     | # of Companies  | 18            | 19              | 18              | 15               | 16                  | 17                 | 19              | 22              | 14              | 12              |
|                | # of Tables     | 33            | 38              | 41              | 38               | 37                  | 39                 | 44              | 42              | 35              | 31              |

| Members        | Active          | 1033          | 972             | 989             | 984              | 949                 | 890                | 911             | 890             | 863             | 784             |

(As of 1-8-16)  
(As of 12-21-15)
### Annual Mtg Finances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$63,108</td>
<td>$73,141</td>
<td>$87,381</td>
<td>$103,706</td>
<td>$96,303</td>
<td>$96,926</td>
<td>$114,100</td>
<td>$102,018</td>
<td>$90,712</td>
<td>$102,774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>$4,539</td>
<td>$11,081</td>
<td>$20,457</td>
<td>$3,970</td>
<td>$35,538</td>
<td>$31,127</td>
<td>$14,379</td>
<td>$7,337</td>
<td>$12,076</td>
<td>$6,849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Donations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Subsidy&lt;br&gt;Received</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$363</td>
<td>$521</td>
<td>$598</td>
<td>$390</td>
<td>$246</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$580</td>
<td>$4,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Expense&lt;br&gt;Received</td>
<td>$16,110</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>$1,481</td>
<td>$2,558</td>
<td>$734</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int Spkr Expense&lt;br&gt;Received</td>
<td>$2,049</td>
<td>$4,985</td>
<td>$1,455</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$510</td>
<td>$1,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century&lt;br&gt;Received</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$265</td>
<td>$18,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21st Cen. Expense&lt;br&gt;Received</td>
<td>$2,844</td>
<td>$565</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td>$2,258</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,969</td>
<td>$2,418</td>
<td>$1,785</td>
<td>$2,353</td>
<td>$3,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21st Cen. Waivers&lt;br&gt;Received</td>
<td>$330.00</td>
<td>$810</td>
<td>$3,280</td>
<td>$2,680</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,280</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime Achievement Award&lt;br&gt;Received</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Award Expense&lt;br&gt;Received</td>
<td>$1,056</td>
<td>$851</td>
<td>$1,396</td>
<td>$929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated&lt;br&gt;Received</td>
<td>$1,238</td>
<td>$485</td>
<td>$1,262</td>
<td>$1183</td>
<td>$1,184</td>
<td>$1,349</td>
<td>$1,406</td>
<td>$1,174</td>
<td>$1,648</td>
<td>$1,508</td>
<td>$12,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other: Publishers, Nonmembers, Guests, Speakers, Spouses

**Donations are received in the fiscal year except 03, 04, 05 which were in calendar year. Expenses were incurred at the January meeting of the same year.
As of 12-16-2015

With the new dues now based on income rather than status, those in the students and retired lines will be distributed elsewhere once they pay dues for 2016.

Race*  
African/African American  50  Caucasian  592  Other  2

*Some members identified more than one race or ethnicity.

State or Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Mbrs</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Mbrs</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Mbrs</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Mbrs</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mbrs</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mbrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>AUSTRIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KENYA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>DENMARK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NETHERLANDS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ECUADOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NORWAY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHILIPPINES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ROMANIA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>HONG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>INDONESIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SWITZERLAND UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IRELAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Religious Affiliation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Mbrs</th>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Mbrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Church of Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Meth. Episcopal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Disciples of Christ</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Dutch Reformed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist Catholic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic-Latin Rite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lutheran/ELCA/MS</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mennonite</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Quaker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazarene</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reformed</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondenominational</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMS Holiness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>United Church</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Unitarian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some members identified more than one denomination.
B. Management Appendices

Management Appendix B.1:
Annual Cycle of Administrative Tasks

August – January: (Normal Operations)
- Day-to-day checks and accounting by Executive Administrator.
- Ensure that committees are meeting and reports are submitted for the Board.
- Draft documents as needed for January Board meetings Annual Business Meeting.
- Review and edit all public documents of the SCE for clarity and economy.
- Budget preparation and financial review. Note that the Treasurer is responsible for the preparation of financial reviews, governmental filings, and other obligatory financial material, although the actual financial and governmental documentation is developed by others, particularly the Executive Administrator. More generally, the Treasurer has responsibility for the oversight of financial functions carried out by the Executive Administrator.
- Arrange for annual review (less than an audit) of the books by an outside accounting firm.
- Executive Administrator periodically sends the review contract out for bids by several firms.

Mailings: Call to Meeting
- Determine and prepare components for the Call to Meeting mailing, including letter from President.
- Executive Administrator calculates meeting budget and resulting registration fees, using a formula filled with cost data from hotel.
- Executive Administrator assembles and e-mails the call to meeting, usually September 1.

Meetings
- Coordinate the planning and execution of the Annual Meeting.
- Executive Administrator maintains lists of agenda items, secures appendices, collates packets, and prepares materials for distribution.

Annual meeting program: plenaries, concurrent sessions, interest groups, working groups:
- Finalize program, principally by adjudicating, ad hoc, new issues, problems and exceptions.
- Executive Administrator identifies SCE members to serve as conveners of concurrent sessions.
- Executive Administrator is the primary contact with the hotel after the contract is signed; Executive Administrator assigns rooms for concurrent sessions, interest groups, and working groups; and arranges room setups; arranges menus; monitors hotel billing for accuracy.
- Executive Administrator processes registration of SCE members.
- Executive Administrator works with the heads of SJE and SSME in registering their attendees, including their sessions into the program book, scheduling meeting space & setup, and invoicing charges to these groups after the meeting.
- Executive Administrator assists *JSCE* Co-Editors by determining which papers will be offered for consideration by the *JSCE*, soliciting referee volunteers, gathering the papers at the meeting, and disseminating them to assigned referees].
Annual Business Meeting of the membership:

- Recruit Secretary, ensure Vice President has appointed a Parliamentarian.
- Identify members to memorialize those who have died.
- Prepare report to the membership on the state of the SCE: new members, change in status members, statistics, future meeting sites.

Two meetings of the Board of Directors (Thursday and Sunday morning):

- Create agendas for both meetings (President, Vice President and Executive Administrator).
- Executive Administrator ensures that annual reports are received from all WG, IG, and caucuses by November 30 for review by Board.
- Assemble reports and documentation for both.
- List of new members for approval; list of student members transitioning to full membership for approval [throughout the year Executive Administrator processes and screens new membership applications, raising borderline cases with leadership].
- Committee reports.
- Financial reports.
- Documents and policies requiring action by the Board.

January – March: (Normal Operations)

- Day-to-day checks and accounting by Executive Administrator.
- Carry out the mandates established by the Board and Executive Committee meetings. For example, refining procedures based on policies approved by the Board for interest groups/working groups.
- Initiate and implement projects proposed by the Board.
- Oversee contracts, ensure performance.
- Communicate with the newly elected President regarding decisions needed and his/her duties.
- New Vice President and President Elect: Identifying possible committee members and resources/themes for plenaries.

Mailings

- Upon receipt of membership application, an introductory email is sent.
- Receipts are emailed upon the processing of payments for dues, registration, and donations.
- Immediately following the Annual Meeting, Executive Administrator emails a welcome note to new members.
- Immediately following the Annual Meeting, assembles and emails the components of the call for proposals for the next annual meeting including letter from President by the end of January.
- Executive Administrator assembles and emails the call to meeting by the end of August.

Meetings

- Spring Executive Committee meeting & Program Committee meeting: Held conjointly at the site of the upcoming annual meeting on a date determined by those attending and availability of the hotel, usually in March or April.
- The President develops the agenda for Executive Committee meeting.
- Executive Administrator assembles documents as needed for that meeting.
- Executive Administrator makes travel and site arrangements.
- Executive Administrator assembles paper/panel proposals and circulates proposals to the Program Committee and other scorers in advance of the meeting.
● Executive Administrator tabulates pre-meeting evaluations of proposals by members of the Program Committee and other scorers.
● The EDSP and the Executive Administrator serve on the Program Committee, ex officio (voice, no vote). Record committee decisions. When ¾ of the slots have been filled, offer suggestions as to how concerns for equity, balance, and breadth of representation of SCE members might be addressed in selections for the remaining program openings.
● Executive Administrator communicates the decisions of the Program Committee to members who submitted paper/panel/interest and working group proposals.

April – June: (Normal Operations)
● Day-to-day checks and accounting by Executive Administrator.
● Treasurer and Executive Administrator work with Conference Direct (for-profit conference planning agency) to identify candidate hotels in 2-3 cities, according to preferences expressed by members when surveyed at Annual Meeting or from Board preferences. Visit up to ten hotels in those cities, usually in an intensive two- or three-day trip in May or June. Negotiate hotel contracts; negotiations typically involve several stages and extend through the summer.
● Respond to new, unprogrammed opportunities which arise (e.g., the contract with Indian publisher to republish the *JSCE*).
● Executive Administrator performs the day-to-day business of maintaining membership lists, collecting dues, and corresponding with members, and responding to the many kinds of situations which present themselves. Problem-solve as needed.
● Ensure that the Manual is updated and posted for the Board.
Management Appendix B.2: 
Duties of the Executive Administrator

**Society of Christian Ethics**

**Description of the Executive Administrator**

The Executive Administrator conducts the day to day business of the Society of Christian Ethics, an international organization of about 850 members. Responsibilities include the areas of marketing, finances, membership, organizing the annual meeting with 500-650 in attendance, and working cooperatively with the Society of Jewish Ethics and the Society for the Study of Muslim Ethics. The Executive Administrator reports to the Personnel Committee, working with the Presidential Cabinet, the Accountant, the Treasurer, Web Programmer, and Co-Editors of the *Journal*.

**Duties of the Executive Administrator**

**Following the Annual Meeting:**

- Send honoraria to appropriate speakers (plenary).
- Send reimbursements to anyone needing them (cancellations that involved immediate family death, illness – reimbursement is registration minus $10, no meals are refunded).
- Document relevant new policies for the insurance renewal.
- Process all walk-in registrations, add-ons, dues from the meeting.
- Check invoices from hotel, negotiating charges not accurate – rates of guest rooms, box delivery charges that were in the contract, comp rooms (give full registration list to hotel so they can credit even those who booked outside of room block).
- Invoice sub-groups of hotel charges: University of Chicago, Lutherans, SJE kosher meals.
- Invoice SJE and SSME for registration and dues, detailing who paid which organizations; what share of the registration fee they get to keep and what comes to SCE to cover breaks, programs, etc.
- Email Board: all Board email list, remind of page for each committee and how to access and only committee has access.
- Pay end of year bills that came in during the meeting.
- Do annual report for Travelers’ workman’s comp insurance.
- Update database:
  - Email those who were approved for membership, transfer in status, and life membership a congratulatory note (form letters (need updating each year) are in the Activities section on the database).
  - Enter date approved for new student and full members in their database records.
  - Change tags from Pending to Full or Student.
  - Add life membership date to new life members; check that the membership has been switched to life level (triggers then being paid for dues); change tag to Life.
  - For the transfers to full, enter the date of their full membership in their database records; change status to full.
  - Add those who attended including speakers.
  - Add active roles in program (papers, authors, panels, conveners/facilitators).
- Update Archives List both on website and in documents:
  - Board.
  - Officers.
  - Nominations.
- Co-Editors, Board.
- Attendance Spreadsheet.
- Themes.
- Interest Groups Spreadsheet.
- Life Members.
- Deceased.
- New members approved.

**Update Website:**
- Take off Meeting’s details – both on Future Meeting page and Next meeting page in the secured area.
- Add next meeting’s details on the Future Meeting page
- Call for Papers.
- Post highlight with the election results.
- Add program, minutes of Board and Business meetings (minutes that have been approved).
- Update all officers and committees, getting photo of the new student convener.
- Unpublish those who had died and were memorialized from the Member News section.
- Unpublish conferences and job openings that have expired.
- As interest and working group reports come in, load new conveners on website, load report and add/take off groups’ members.
- Update the Manual if necessary and post.

**Update files:**
- Hotel costs (in finance folder).
- Hotel contracts.
- Hotel room pick up.
- Advisor matches.

Send welcome email to new members approved at meeting. Include dues statement for those not in attendance.

**Update new letterhead and personalize for Executive Director, President, President Elect, Vice President, Book Review Editor, Treasurer, and Co-Editors.**

**Make sure the office has received agenda, minutes, and handouts of both Board meetings and the Business meeting.**

**Email President past years’ letters for the Call.**

**Set deadlines with Presidential Cabinet for the Call for Papers.** Once forms have been updated and President has written cover letter, send to SJE and SSME to get their proposal form(s) to include.

**(E)Mail Call for Proposals:**
- Cover Letter – President.
- Dues Form for those who owe.
- Theme for next meeting, if any.
- Forms for paper, interest groups, panels, breakfast author, and volunteer sign-up (not included in mailing but posted on website).
- Eligibility Policy /Selection Process.
- SJE and SSME call for papers.
- Sample proposals (on website only).
- SE or SSCE call for papers (on website only).
- Any changed Bylaws.

**Remind Executive Board and Program Committee of the dates of the Spring meeting, when to arrive and depart.** Arrange any air transportation requested by committee members. Communicate with the hotel: a listing of names and dates of arrival and departure of
committee, meeting space Friday and Saturday, meals and break foods, meeting with hotel. All costs will be covered by SCE.

- Send notice to publishers of marketing opportunities.
- If evaluations were completed, compile for Program Committee.
- Add to the spreadsheets the details of the past meeting:
  - Actual cost comparisons.
  - Actual food details.
- Email membership list of students, junior faculty, contingent faculty and women to the conveners of those caucuses.

**January-March:**

- Book airfare for Program and Executive Committee.
- Reserve hotel rooms.
- Select menus and sites for meals for the Spring meeting.
- As proposal forms come in, make sure that policies are followed (cannot present papers 2 years in a row, must have dues paid, and if student, must have passed qualifying exams):
  - Enter each on the appropriate excel page to track.
  - Assign papers a number for blind review.
  - Begin to enter abstracts in a word document making sure no identifying information is included (for blind review).
  - Date author submissions as those are on first come basis.
  - Track volunteers, including referees and their interests.
  - Enter interests on database for future use.
  - Verify all information is accurate on database.
- Once deadline for proposals has come, send to committee members the rating sheets and the abstracts for blind review, giving deadline when scores are to be returned.
- Once all scores are submitted, enter and tabulate all scores. Print spreadsheets for committee members by score and by last name (include member status on printouts; have papers, panels, and interest groups all on the same printout if all wanting concurrent time). Bring samples of past years’ schedules, newsprint for new program and concurrent session assignments, glue sticks, tent name cards, and slips with all proposals on them (print title, presenter, AV needs, and if paper/panel/IG, WG on each slip).
- On Concurrent slips, have Paper Number, Presenter, title, AV, Student, Women, race, gender, religion.
- Schedule time to meet with hotel staff to do walk through, seeing meeting space, gain restaurant listings, information needed by exhibitors, what signs the hotel will allow, obtain AV pricing and menus/costs. Set deadlines for registration, menus, space assigning, etc.
- Assist President with materials for Executive Board and program meetings. Email materials to them in advance, including schedule of the weekend, agenda of Executive Board, and directions/address of the hotel. Bring extra copies to meeting.
- Copies to take to the Spring Meeting:
  - Last year’s program – 8
  - Interest and other groups @ AM – 12
  - Evaluations from recent meeting – 6
  - Schedule for multiple years – 12
  - Committee list – 6
  - Compensation list – 4
  - Responses to proposals
  - Reimbursement forms – 12
  - Tent name cards
Minutes of Thursday and Sunday Board Meeting

Schedule of the Executive Board/Program Committee: varies year to year

- Friday: 8am Executive Board meeting
  Dinner at 6:30pm
- Saturday: 8am Program Committee meeting
  First departure for flights: 6pm

- Facilitate the Program Committee meeting as needed:
  - President share his/her vision for the program, including plenaries and/or pre-conference events.
  - Review evaluation comments from previous meeting (sent in advance of meeting).
  - Determine Schedule of the Annual Meeting (handout showing past years’ schedules).
    - Awareness of other “special groups” that are scheduling as well. (handout)
    - Committee negotiates on papers, panels, interest groups that get time on the program.
      (SCE has 10 rooms for each concurrent session— not including SJE and SSME room. # of papers depends on # of concurrent sessions, # of panels and interest groups in concurrent time slots).
    - Committee assigns which papers etc in each of the concurrent time slots.
      - Aware of topic conflicts, media needs, balance of presenters.

February:
- For any members who did not pay their dues by the deadline given in notice, mark their file on the database accordingly.
- Recruit more ads for the next issue of the Journal.

March:
- Submit to Georgetown the mailing list for the Journal.
- Bill publishers with ads in the Journal by invoicing and including a “tear sheet”.
- Mail 3 copies of the Journal to ATLA, 1 copy to the archives, 1 to JSTOR, 1 to ProQuest, electronic to MUSE, and copies to any international members who have difficulty receiving.

After Program Committee meeting:
- Already begin to put the program booklet together, listing the schedule and the papers, etc assigned to each concurrent session.
- Send acceptance, rejection letters.
- As acceptances come in, enter the abstracts in the program. They should be approximately 100 words in length. They usually have to send acceptance of inclusion within 1 month but have until August to do the abstract.
- Share draft of program and list of referee volunteers with Co-Editors.
- Once all acceptances are in, then program draft can be sent to those who offered to convene, facilitate; and posted on website. Assign according to their preferences.
- Record outcome of the Advisor Initiative.
- Arrange space for the needs of SJE and SSME for their program as well as other groups such as JRE, Lutheran Ethicists, University of Chicago reception, etc.
- Negotiate with hotel all meals, room set ups, and audio visual. Try to have BEOs (Banquet and Event Orders) done by October or early November –must be done prior to sending program to printers.
- Email audio visual contract to those presenters indicating use of equipment.

June/July:
- Send reminders to the following:
Those on the program that have not submitted their abstracts.
Nomination Committee to submit the slate of nominees.
Send to the Pacific Region chair a list of members in the western states and Canada.
Ensure that the necessary documentation is sent to Tennessee to continue the corporation of the Society.
Recruit more ads for the next issue of the Journal.
Post IG/WG abstracts on their web pages.
Once the President Elect decides who will be at the Executive Board and Program Committee, survey attendees of the possible dates so a date can be selected that works for the Spring Meeting. Once a date is secured, confirm with all.
Contact all who need to verify that the Manual is current; update the Manual if necessary and post to the website.

August:
Develop with the President the Call to Meeting (e)mailing, which should be mailed by late August/early September. Mailing should include:
- Letter from President
- Registration form
- Dues form
- Hotel registration form – on website only
- Ground travel information – on website only
- Slate of Board Nominees – on website only
- Student Caucus info for students – on website only
- Junior Faculty Caucus info – on website only
- Pre-conference information – on website only
- Any proposed changes to bylaws
Send email regarding waivers to all students who have identified themselves as a person of color: two different emails – one for new members and the other for returning students.
Confirm master billing with hotel:
- Credit application.
- Tax exemption.
- List of individuals and what charges should be on the master account.
Confirm menus and numbers with the hotel.
Send notice to publishers of marketing opportunities and details of the annual meeting, with Nov. 1 deadline to accommodate printing of program.
Remind Georgetown to pay royalties before the end of September.
Once registration fees are determined, send notice to nonmember speakers.
Email inactives that Call to Meeting is on website, etc
Recruit advisors for the Advisor Initiative (past Board, Program Committee, JSCE Editorial Board, members who have papers every other year).

September:
Email all student and junior faculty members (7 yrs after PhD) regarding Advisor Initiative so matches can be made by November 1st.

October:
Submit to Georgetown the mailing list for the Journal.
Bill publishers with ads in the Journal by invoicing and including a “tear sheet”.
Mail 3 copies of the Journal to ATLA, 1 copy to the archives, 1 to JSTOR, 1 to ProQuest, electronic to MUSE, and copies to any international members who have difficulty receiving.
• Update the master listing of articles and books reviewed, and reload on the website.
• Confirm with the hotel the “Program of Events” indicating which sessions are in which rooms, room setup, media needed, etc.
• Process Quickbooks with the Accountants:
  o Do all journal entries of income and expenses that is for the next year. Make sure there are no unclassified items (must be general, AM, or Journal).
  o Contact accountants and send QB file.
• After QB Returns:
  o Complete journal entries.
  o Process any payments/expenses that came in since sending to the accountant.

October-December:
• Process registrations:
  o Check information on the database.
  o Enter dues payment.
  o Complete payment process/deposit.
  o Enter on excel registration tracking.
• Track author assignments so that we know when tables are full and no more can be accepted for particular authors.
• Assign conveners and facilitators per their preferences.
• Continue to send new referee volunteers to the Co-Editors as well as any program changes.
• Assist any plenary speakers with travel and hotel arrangements.
• By late November, send reminder to members to register by deadline. Also email those in the program that have yet to register.
• Receive registrations form the SJE and SSME and process.
• Create calendar for Presidential Cabinet.
• Confirm meeting spaces for committees.
• Organize Board appendices to be in same order as agenda.
• Book flights for President, President Elect, Vice President, Co-Editors, ED, Plenary speakers, Lifetime Achievement Award recipient and guest, and Staff.
• Program book needs to go to printers in pdf file by Thanksgiving. Book is 8 ½ x 11”, black and white only, cover is cardstock. Publisher of the Journal has first option on the back cover but pays for it. SJE and SSME items are listed at the end of each time period.

December:
• Prepare dues statements for anyone who has not paid the current year or the previous year. Those with outstanding dues for the previous year will be marked as inactive and not eligible to receive a Journal issue after the deadline (in early February).
• Print prior to meeting:
  o Signs for each meeting room on legal paper.
  o Nametags for SCE, SJE, SSME, non-members (no logo).
  o Labels for BwA tickets.
  o If specific entrée choices made, labels for those lunches.
  o Labels for registration envelopes.
  o JSCE form for SJE/SSME to order JSCE and re associate membership.
  o JSCE assessment form – merge with referee assigned list.
  o JSCE directions.
  o Labels for referee/paper envelopes.
  o Convener directions – give to presenters and conveners.
  o Facilitator directions – give to authors and facilitators.
- BwA table signs.
- BwA circle labels.
- BwA attendees for facilitator and authors.
- Print Junior Faculty, Student, Women attendees for conveners.
- Waiver list and WG budgets for WG conveners and President, Vice President, President Elect.
- Welcome sheet for new members.
- Note in Life and transfers that they will be acknowledged at the Business Meeting.
- Reminder in Board and Candidates to pick up Sunday Board materials after 7pm on Saturday.
- Owe sheets - attach to outside of registration packet.
- Tour lists.
- Add on meal sheets.
- Ballots and ½ ballots.
- Student Assistant schedules – copy in each of their registration packet as well as for office.
- Job openings for bulletin board.
- List of attendees (name, institution) for bulletin board.
- Exhibitor companies on tent card with no. of tables to put on their tables.
- Tent name cards for Board, JSCE Editorial Board, those on ballot. For Board, include committees they are on.
- Extra sets of Board materials (usually 4-5 will ask for them at the meeting but not have requested prior).
- Minutes of last year’s Business Meeting.
- Restaurant list.

• In registration packets, include (printed 600 copies for registration materials, 350 copies for Business Meeting, printed 625 programs):
  - Welcome to new members.
  - Slate of nominees – if included in program, don’t need to print separately.
  - Program.
  - Receipt (now done electronically).
  - Student caucus reminder for students (80 copies).
  - Junior faculty caucus reminder (80 copies).
  - Flyer for Societas Ethica, SSCE, Pacific Region meeting, pre-conference.
  - Dues statements for those who have not yet paid including new members.
  - Instructions for conveners (100 copies), facilitators (70 copies) in presenters and conveners/facilitators packets.
  - Report form and policy for conveners of interest and working groups (45 copies).
  - SJE program sheet in SJE packets.
  - In small envelopes:
    • Nametag (on 1 day only put Thursday Day Pass at bottom instead of SCE, SJE, SSME).
    • Tickets for meals purchased or Tours:
      Student
      Women
      Junior Faculty
      Author Breakfast
      Shabbat Lunch
      Shabbat Dinner
      Tours
  • Ribbons—mark outside envelope with R to remind them of ribbon:
    - New Members, Press, Exhibitors, Staff.
- Board, Officers, Editors, Plenary Speakers – for all 3 societies.
  - Compare hotel reservations to registration – email those with hotel room reminding to register.
  - Compare registration with those on program – email those not registered.
  - Do stats for Board.
  - Highlight similar names on outside registration envelopes to make sure the right packet is given.
  - If check is put in registration packet (stipend, refund), mark on outside envelope so it is mentioned.
  - Write checks for stipends, refunds.
  - If any BwA table only has 2 (author and facilitator) or 3 at it, cancel prior to giving counts to the hotel; let them choose refund or another author.
  - Registration materials, etc needs to be mailed by December 24 to hotel. Other materials to be shipped include:
    - Registration forms with the late fee incorporated and authors marked “Full”.
    - Hotel Signs.
    - New member applications for SCE, SJE, SSME.
    - Ballots 375 for primary, 375 for secondary.
    - Financial Statements for Business Meeting.
    - Minutes of Board and Business Meetings.
    - Any materials ready for the Board meetings or Business Meeting.
    - Restaurant listing.
    - Name tent cards for Board meetings, JSCE.
    - Name cards for Author breakfast.
    - Blank dues forms for SCE, SJE, SSME.
    - Restaurant and area attractions (400 copies).
    - Daily rates.
    - Print spreadsheet of rooms in use.
    - Print worship aides for Ecumenical Service and Catholic Eucharist.

- Carry to the meeting:
  - All late registrations.
  - Print outs (copy for desk and copies for conveners):
    - Women Caucus – Including Veg.
    - Student Caucus - Including Veg.
    - Breakfast – By Author
    - Breakfast – By Registration – Alphabet by Registrant
    - Breakfast – Each Table for Author
  - “Hotel” Program – Add who is contact or paying for special meals/events.

- Email Board members about details of the Thursday Board meeting.

**Tasks at the Annual Meeting:**

- Tuesday and Wednesday:
  - Have Board packets ready.
  - Deliver exhibitor boxes to right tables.
  - Set up registration.
  - Get hours, location, prices of Copy Center.
  - Add referee names to referee packets.
  - Add refund checks to registration packets. Highlight front label.
  - Add dots to same name.
  - Make up extra packets with basics.
  - Put lists of those attending in conveners’ packets of junior faculty, student, women’s, WG.
- Make sure that we have outline of agenda for minute takers at both Board meetings and Business Meeting. Have on laptop and flashdrive in case they want to use their own laptop.
- Buy paper and any other supplies needed (toner, ink).
- Set up bulletin board.
- Hotel:
  - Confirm # for meals, breaks.
  - Coat racks.
  - BwA: Do NOT reduce number of tables to match count – different book at each table; sign holders (stanchions) on each table.
  - 3 stanchions needed for office (2 for registration, 1 for papers).
  - Review setup for exhibit hall (3 extra tables for SCE, SJE, SSME; Presidential reception), Catholic Eucharist, ecumenical worship service, other receptions.
  - Containers for badge holders.
  - Discount for printing, spa, etc.
  - Meet with accounting on Monday morning; have invoices brought the day following events (example Friday invoices delivered on Saturday).
- Put out badge holders – have strings inside the holders.
- Put out box to recycle envelopes and badge holders.
- For the Thursday Board Meeting:
  - Prior to Board meetings deliver to the meeting room: needed materials, tent namecards, gavel.
  - New Member.
  - Complete Financials.
  - Journal Finances.
  - Attendance/Membership spreadsheet.
  - Minutes – Sunday.
  - Minutes – Thursday.
  - SCE/Annual Meeting Statistics.xls.
  - Reports to the Board: Caucuses, working groups.
  - Other reports on the agenda.
  - Notated Agenda for recording secretary.
- Throughout the meeting:
  - If presenters cancel, write on sign outside of room and note in Master program.
  - Record attendance at each session in Master program.
  - Record leftover food amounts in Master program.
  - Record changes in conveners in Master program.
  - Daily change room signs.
  - Attend committee meetings:
    - Finance Committee.
    - Working Group conveners.
    - GUP and Co-Editors.
    - International Scholar.
- Friday:
  - Have 3 plates, 6 goblets, 3 pita breads for Saturday Catholic Eucharist.
  - Finalize materials for Saturday Business Meeting: Finance report, participant list, agenda, updated stat sheet.
  - Print and collate Business Meeting materials.
  - Post participant list (name, institution, status) on bulletin board and have a few copies for those who want them.
  - Print meetings and membership stats for exhibitors.
Saturday:
  o For the Business Meeting:
    ▪ Give note and President Lapel pin to the President Elect: At the Business Meeting: Announce that attendance sheets are available at the registration desk, that elected and current Board members to pick up Sunday Board materials after 7pm at the registration desk; to give pin to President at end of Business Meeting.
    ▪ Prior to Business Meeting deliver: gavel, any recognition plaque.
    ▪ Agenda: 325 – print onsite.
    ▪ Minutes: 325 - print prior and ship.
    ▪ Ballot: 325 - print prior and ship.
    ▪ Secondary Ballots: 163 - print prior and ship.
    ▪ New Member List: 325 – print onsite.
    ▪ Notated Agenda for recording secretary.
  o Have 3 plates, 4 goblets, 2 pita breads, grape juice for Sunday Ecumenical Service.

For the Sunday Board Meeting:
  o Prior to Board meeting and the JSCE Editorial Board meeting, deliver to the meeting room: needed materials, tent namecards, gavel.
  o Agenda.
  o Minutes – Thursday.
  o Notated Agenda for Recording Secretary.

Any time in the Year:
  o Negotiate, with the Treasurer with hotel for meeting location in future years. Keep in mind:
    o Location (neighborhood, restaurants in area, ease to reach from airport).
    o Cost of airfares from various location in US.
    o Adequate meeting space (need 12 breakout rooms for minimum 50 each) plus ballrooms for total group meetings and exhibitors/break/registration area.
    o Cost of hotel rooms.
    o Attrition clauses and guarantees.
  o Once contract is signed, add to hotel spreadsheet giving details of contract.
  o Process dues payments and update database with any changes.
  o Keep QuickBooks current with deposits and payments made, and reconciling with monthly bank statements.
  o Monthly update the secured membership list on the website. Be sure to edit those that have ` in their names, delete the year and SJE in the status column.
  o Sell mailing list of membership: Be sure to get a draft of mailing piece to ensure that it is appropriate for membership. Track sales to make sure that list is paid for each time it is used.
  o Process new membership applications, making sure the person meets criteria. Any that are in doubt, discuss with Presidential Cabinet. Maintain list of pending members (both student and full), those requesting to transfer status (student to full, and to life status). Acknowledge each application with an email.
  o Process any correspondence.
  o Process any copyright permission requests.
  o Process financial statements.
  o Post job openings and announcements (conferences, etc) to website.
# Management Appendix B.3:
## Table of Expenses for the Annual Meeting and the Spring Meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Stipend</th>
<th>When Pd</th>
<th>Airfare</th>
<th>Hotel*</th>
<th>Meals</th>
<th>Other Exp</th>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>only those w/meetings</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, copying</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>Meals, room service not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Elect</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>only those w/meetings</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, copying</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>Meals, room service not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>only those w/meetings</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>Meals, room service not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Editors (each)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>at meeting</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, copying</td>
<td>waived</td>
<td>Meals, room service not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Review Editor</td>
<td>2000 w/ $150 postage budget</td>
<td>at meeting</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>Mailing costs</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>Meals, room service not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners Responsible for hosting Breakfast w/Authors - introducing and promoting JSCE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing/Copy Editor (Discretionary)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>at meeting</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>Meals, room service not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>at meeting</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes if must arrive day early</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>none included</td>
<td>waived</td>
<td>Meals, room service not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Administrator (EA)</td>
<td>Salary/Contract w/ 3% annual April increase</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, copying</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No room service or alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Dir for Strategic Planning</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Biannually January AM &amp; July 1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>only those w/meetings</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, copying</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>Meals, room service not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Members</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>At meeting suggested</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes if must arrive day early</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>Meals, room service not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Speakers-SCE/SJE/SSME members</td>
<td>up to $1000</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes***</td>
<td>yes***</td>
<td>up to IRS per diem rate w/ receipts</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, copying</td>
<td>waived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Speakers-Nonmember</td>
<td>up to $1000</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes***</td>
<td>yes***</td>
<td>up to IRS per diem rate w/ receipts</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, copying</td>
<td>waived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG Guest speakers (non-members)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>no***</td>
<td>no***</td>
<td>not included***</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>waived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime Achievement Award Winner</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>waived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panels during concurrent sessions</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>no***</td>
<td>no***</td>
<td>not included***</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Full time&quot; Meeting Assistants</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>At meeting</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, copying</td>
<td>waived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Member Assistants</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>reimbursed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSCE representative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>waived or reimbursed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Groups (3)</td>
<td>$3000 approved at 04.16 Exec Comm Mtg &amp; to be reviewed again 04.19</td>
<td>At meeting.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>possibility for waivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Welcome to invite guests to Presidential Reception and one (1) guest to Board dinner.

registration would be $40 per day, $140 for the entire meeting, or 0 if coming just for the IG.

"Full time" Meeting Assistants:
- $900
- At meeting
- Yes
- Parking, ground travel, copying
- Waived

No room service or alcohol

Working Group chairs are responsible for encouraging attendance at Working Group gatherings. Attendance should be submitted to EA after AM. Future waivers for individual members is contingent on attending Working Group.

***The International Speaker Fund may cover these expenses for speakers from outside the US.

*All points earned at meetings will be used only for the Society's official business.

---

### President or Appointed Representative at Other Meetings: Expenses Covered by SCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>Airfare**</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Other Exp</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSCE</td>
<td>SSCE</td>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>SSCE</td>
<td>SCE: ground travel</td>
<td>Meals/internet charges are responsibility of person attending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societas Ethica - every 3 yrs</td>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>SCE: ground travel</td>
<td>Meals/internet charges are responsibility of person attending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Region</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>SCE - 2 nights max</td>
<td>SCE: ground travel; Pacific: parking</td>
<td>Pacific: Meals for day of meeting; all others responsibility of person attending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Salary and benefits of Executive Administrator: Annual 3% increase in salary paid in April for Executive Administrator.

**International airfare will be covered to a maximum of $400; Incoming VPs and Pres seek first institutional money, and SCE will reimburse airfare as last resort.
### Spring Meeting Expenses Covered by SCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Airfare**</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Other Exp</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, IRS meal per diem for mtg city</td>
<td>room service, internet not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Elect</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, IRS meal per diem for mtg city</td>
<td>room service, internet not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, IRS meal per diem for mtg city</td>
<td>room service, internet not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, IRS meal per diem for mtg city</td>
<td>room service, internet not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Editors</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, IRS meal per diem for mtg city</td>
<td>room service, internet not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive /Program Committee - Three (3) major chairs of Finance/Long-Term, Personnel &amp; By-Laws, &amp; Technology &amp; Intersociety Relations (replaces Board &quot;class&quot; as of 04.17)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, IRS meal per diem for mtg city</td>
<td>room service, internet not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Dir for Strategic Planning</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, IRS meal per diem for mtg city</td>
<td>room service, internet not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Administrator</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, IRS meal per diem for mtg city, and internet</td>
<td>room service, internet not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, IRS meal per diem for mtg city</td>
<td>room service, internet not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Site Representative for Program Committee Meeting</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Parking, ground travel, IRS meal per diem for mtg city</td>
<td>room service, internet not included; alcoholic beverages covered only at board dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJE Representative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Return to Table of Contents**

**Return to The Membership**

**Return to Governance and Management**

**Return to Finances and Budgeting**

**Return to the Annual Meeting**

**Return to Media**
C. JSCE Appendices

JSCE APPENDIX C.1: Preparing a Manuscript

https://scethics.org/journal-sce/preparing-manuscript

Since papers submitted to the JSCE for review at or before the Annual Meeting are presented first at the Annual Meeting of the SCE, SJE and SSME, authors are expected to prepare their work following the standards of academic scholarship and, with the notice above, IRB approval when research involves human subjects. The Co-Editors recognize that these papers may be developed in a style appropriate for presentation, and may include a colloquial tone. However, papers submitted for JSCE review must be submitted in prose; presentations in PowerPoint or other outline form are not acceptable.

All papers that are submitted to the JSCE for review should include a 100-150 word abstract at the start; although it may reflect in part, the abstract does not replace the introduction to the paper. Panel presentations in plenary, concurrent, or interest group sessions may be submitted to the JSCE for review. Recognizing the likely colloquial nature of some presentations, however, the JSCE requires that panel submissions adhere to the academic standards of scholarship and scholarly presentation. The Co-Editors recommend the following options:

1. That one of the panelists assumes the work of collating and merging the panelists’ respective works to create a single document (this option requires the development of an introduction, presents a break between each of the panelists’ work by identifying the author and title of their presentation, and includes if available any prepared response by yet another member of the panel).

2. That one of the panelists assumes the work of weaving the panel presentations into a single document (this option requires the development of an introduction, transitions from one panelist’s work to the next, and a conclusion).

Papers should be developed using The Chicago Manual of Style. The JSCE employs the traditional rather than the author-date system of documentation and uses endnotes. Nevertheless, papers may be submitted at the time of the Annual Meeting of the SCE with footnotes or endnotes; these references may be single-spaced. The body of the text should be double-spaced type using a 12 point “Times New Roman” or other simple font.

Manuscripts must be submitted in both hard copy and electronic form. The JSCE needs four hard copies (one for each of the two referees, and one for each of the Co-Editors) and an electronic copy for both the archive and to facilitate editing for publication. We prefer Microsoft Word XML (.docx).

Essays that are accepted for publication will be sent to authors with format editing, comments and requests for additional information, and suggestions for cutting, splicing, and other author-generated revision. Since authors will have time for revision, it is not essential that the manuscript you first submit meets precisely the style specifications of the JSCE-Georgetown University Press Guidelines although we recommend that you follow the formatting guidelines of Georgetown University Press below. Your cooperation in following these guidelines will facilitate the
development of the manuscript for the volume and issue of the *JSCE* in which the essay will appear.

**Guideline provided by Georgetown University Press:**

**GENERAL FORMATTING**

1. The entire manuscript is double spaced, including endnotes, extracts, and references, and uses the 12-point Times New Roman font throughout the manuscript.
2. All em-dashes—which when typeset will resemble these—in the text are indicated by two consecutive hyphens without space before, between, or after them, so that they appear—like this. If your word processing program automatically formats a dash to appear as an em-dash—like this—be sure there are no extra spaces before or after it.
3. The first paragraph of each new section is set flush left and all subsequent paragraphs are indented using tabs.
4. The first use of an abbreviation is spelled out in the text followed by the abbreviated form in parentheses, e.g., Federal Bureau of Investigations (F.B.I.). All subsequent mentions of the abbreviation may use the abbreviated form only. Please use periods between the letters.
5. All unusual symbols (i.e., symbols that are not included in basic word processing software) are labeled with their correct name in the margin in each place they appear.
6. The first use of a diacritical mark (acute accent, cedilla, etc.) is noted in the margin of the text.
7. The entire manuscript has been prepared in the same word processing program (Microsoft Word). If you have converted the manuscript from another program, check each file to be certain that no data was lost. Clean up any extra spaces or incorrect characters that may have been added.
8. Automatic hyphenation and widow-orphan protection have been turned off in your word processing program.
9. All quotations have been compared with original sources for accuracy and completeness.
10. All references have been checked for accuracy, completeness, and consistency of style. Each reference must have a corresponding text mention.
11. All endnotes are double spaced and are in 12-point Times font. They are formatted in *Chicago Manual of Style* Documentation Two style (author-date), numbered consecutively in the text as superscript numerals throughout each chapter, are listed (using base-aligned numerals) at the end of each chapter or grouped by chapter at the end of the book, and placed before the references.
12. Every page is numbered consecutively in the top, right-hand corner of the manuscript straight through from beginning to end in Arabic numerals. To number a manuscript consecutively across different electronic files: In Word - After choosing "Page numbers" from the "Insert" menu, click on "Format" on the box; choose "start at" and type in the page number with which you wish the file to begin.
13. All headers and footers have been removed.
14. All figures and tables are numbered using chapter number plus figure number, e.g., Figure 3.2 and Table 2.1. Figures and tables should not be embedded in the text. The manuscript and disks will be returned to you if they contain embedded figures or tables.

**ENDNOTES AND REFERENCES**

1. Please indicate in-text note references by typing a superscript number and then create a separate file for the notes or place them as a group at the end of the paper. Please do not use the footnote or endnote feature of your word processing program to create "embedded"
notes. They can easily be severed from the text and lost when converting from one software program or platform to another. Place all endnotes at the end of the paper.

2. All in-text note numbers are superscript, and all note numbers preceding the note itself are base aligned.

3. Endnotes are formatted consistently and correctly using Documentation Two style (author-date) of the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

4. Endnotes are numbered consecutively in each chapter and are either grouped by chapter at the end of the manuscript before the reference list or placed at the end of their respective chapters.

5. All endnote numbers in the text have corresponding endnotes that are correct and accurate.

6. All references are formatted consistently. Please use Documentation One style (humanities), as explained in the most recent edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style* for bibliographic/reference sources, and Documentation Two style (author-date), as explained in the *Chicago Manual of Style* for endnotes.

7. All references have been checked for completeness and accuracy.

8. All citations made in the text are listed in the references and all references listed in the reference can be found in the text. Please double-check this.

9. In the reference list, all successive works by the same author(s) after the first appearance are preceded by six unspaced dashes (three em-dashes) and a period in lieu of the author's(s') name(s).
**JSCE Appendix C.2:**
**IRB Regulations**

[https://scethics.org/policies-and-procedures](https://scethics.org/policies-and-procedures)

**IRB Regulations on Research Involving Human Subjects**

As some members of the Society of Christian Ethics begin to engage research methodologies that include data gathering by means of research involving human subjects, the SCE recognizes that this type of research may fall under the purview of the US Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Human Research Protections and Federal Code Regulations 45 CFR Part 46 (Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, also known as the “Common Rule”; full text or analogous agencies in other countries. In order to ensure that the highest standards of research are employed in studies that include the participation of human subjects and consistent with the “Standards of Professional Conduct” of the SCE, the SCE requires of its members conducting research with human subjects, which they propose and intend to present at the Annual Meeting or a Regional Meeting of the SCE, that they seek approval from a local Institutional Review Board (IRB) or its analogue in countries outside of the US in compliance with the “Common Rule” or with analogous laws of other countries. The “Common Rule” requires that research involving human subjects undergo scrutiny by and receive approval from an IRB or its analogue prior to the start of study to ensure that subjects are protected from harm (policy approved, SCE Board of Directors, January 8, 2009).

Dedicated to promoting “scholarly work in Christian ethics and in the relation of Christian ethics to other traditions of ethics, and to social, economic, political and cultural problems” (“Purpose,” SCE), the SCE is increasingly aware of the benefits of interdisciplinary initiatives and members have begun to use some of the research methodologies of complementary disciplines. Likewise, SCE members utilize published historical and contemporary studies that address various human rights and social justice issues in national and international contexts as well as pioneering research that depends upon the participation of research subjects. Particularly regarding research in applied ethics, individuals and groups have been consulted, interviewed, and/or observed with a view to the ethicist’s descriptive, analytical, and evaluative research followed by the presentation of findings based in part on the ethicist’s work with human subjects. It is to these methodologies used for research proposed and intended for presentation at Annual or Regional meetings that the SCE policy regarding research with human subjects is directed.

Moreover, rather than being a burden to SCE members, the requirement of IRB/analogue approval reminds researchers of their professional responsibility to ensure that appropriate protections are in place before they initiate studies that involve human subjects (see *JSCE*, “Publication Criteria,” SCE website or the Office for Human Research Protections Investigator Responsibility Frequently Asked Questions. When in doubt, consult your local IRB/analogue).

The SCE is committed to the highest standards of scholarship and conduct among our members and between our members and the communities they serve, and the subjects—personal and theoretical—they investigate. Recognizing the “Standards of Professional Conduct” and the “Purpose” of the SCE, members of the Society have particular professional commitments and responsibilities; chief among them is the protection of human subjects before, during, and after the conduct of research that involves methodologies based on data gathering by ethnographic studies, fieldwork, interviews, deliberate observation, etc. Our principal concern is that “our examination of moral issues shall respect the dignity of persons whose practices and positions we study.”
Some examples of scholarly activity to which this IRB Policy applies:

1. Interviews with administrators at religiously-based or secular facilities or agencies (health care, academic, corporate, government, social) on how religious values are incorporated into practice.
2. Surveys of patients or clients asking how their religious views influence(d) their decisions.
3. Assessment of a new curriculum on training providers to perform spiritual or value assessments that involves additional work (focus groups, feedback, etc.) on the part of the students.
4. Comparison of coping skills and/or health status of participants of a weekly Bible study with participants in a secular book club.
5. Longitudinal assessment of students’ or participants’ spiritual needs or beliefs throughout their educational experience.
6. Ethnographic studies, fieldwork, focus group session(s), deliberate observation and recording of the findings about the human subjects studied, engaged, and/or observed (especially where these findings include identifying marks or information about the persons studied in areas of political or social unrest).
7. Interviews with and/or survey instruments administered to people at and about their work, play, worship, diet, family, and/or about information that is readily identified as sensitive (e.g., regarding race, ethnicity, culture, sexuality, health and/or health status, etc).

Some examples of scholarly activity to which this policy does not apply:

1. Analysis, interpretation, and/or constructive theorizing about published sources only.
2. Research using material, including published interviews, already available in the public domain.
3. Research intended to interpret past events, intellectual movements, and/or history and which does not use “live” interviews as one of the means of collecting data.
4. Observation of public behavior that does not include investigator interaction.
5. Research conducted in routine educational settings on instruction strategies or in comparison with alternative techniques for assessment and/or instruction, curricula and/or its development, and/or classroom management methods.

Much of the work among the members of the SCE would qualify as exempt. However, whenever research involves human subjects as part of the research methodology of collecting data, that research protocol ought to be submitted to a local IRB; the IRB is the party responsible for the determination that a research protocol is exempt from these policy requirements. For the official/federal guidelines determining research that qualifies as exempt from this policy see 45 CFR §46.101 (b).

45 CFR §46.102 Definitions (abbreviated).
(d) Research means a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.
(f) Human subject means a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains (1) Data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or (2) Identifiable private information.
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JSCE Appendix C.3: 
Permission Form

Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics
Reprint Permission Request

Permission must be sought prior to copying. Please submit the following information.

Person Requesting Permission: _____________________________________________________

Tel: ______________ Fax:____________________ Email: ______________________

Position: ____________________ Institution: _________________________________

Mailing Address:_______________________________________________________________

City: ___________________________ State: ___________ Zip: _______________________

Country: ________________________ Country Code: __________________________

Article Title: _______________________________________________

Article Author(s): ________________________________

Issue/Year: ________________ Pages: __________________________

___ To be included in course packets:
   How many copies? _____
   Name of course:__________________________

___ To be included in published works.
   Name of Anthology: ____________________________
   ____ Editor is not the author of article
   ____ Editor is the author of article

Charges:

Course Packets: No charge for copying. But we ask that you (1) indicate "reprinted by 
permission of the JSCE, [date]" on the first page of the reprinted article and that you (2) notify the 
SCE (sce@scethics.org) which article you are using for your course.

Articles within published works:
   • $100 if the Editor is not the author of the article. $50 of this will be forwarded to the 
     author.
   • No charge if the Editor is the author of the article.
An exception is made to this policy in cases that meet the following four criteria:

1. The press/publisher who brings out the volume is also the press/publisher who brings out the *JSCE*.
2. The copyright to the essay is presumptively or explicitly held either by that publisher or the SCE.
3. The essays to be included in the volume are exclusively from the *JSCE* and/or the *Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics*.
4. The editors of the volume are members of the SCE.

In such exceptional cases, the Society will waive the $50 honorarium for the authors, so long as the press and editors agree to provide each contributor with (a) early notice of their intent to republish the essay and (b) at least one gratis copy of the published collection. In addition, the editors and publisher should agree that if sales surpass a particular threshold (1,000 copies seems reasonable but the actual figure may need to be negotiated with the publisher), the press will, at that point, pay each of the authors the usual $50 honorarium.

Please return this form by fax to Linda Schreiber at 320-252-6984 or by mail to Linda Schreiber, Society of Christian Ethics, PO Box 5126, St. Cloud MN U.S.A.
JSCE Appendix C.4: Guidance for Referees and Manuscript Evaluation Form

Referee Responsibilities, Criteria for Evaluation, General Assessment

Responsibilities of the JSCE Referees
1. Referees are expected to give each manuscript they are assigned a close reading. Please pick up the paper(s) from the SCE/SJE/SSME registration desk immediately before the opening session of the annual meeting.

2. Referees are also expected to attend the session at which the author presents the paper, staying for the discussion as well as the presentation itself. If you are also convening the session, please do not have the paper with you during the presentation to preserve referee anonymity. Referees should also include in their evaluation remarks about the reception of the paper. If your assessment of the manuscript differs from your assessment of the presentation and discussion, please include an explanation in your remarks.

3. In preparing evaluations, referees should consider the criteria for paper selection. Keep these criteria in mind and allude to them where appropriate, but do not feel compelled to use them as a grid. If you believe that a paper ought to be published in the JSCE even though it does not meet these particular criteria, please feel free to argue why even while keeping these criteria in mind. Referees are expected to make a summary judgment of the paper including a numerical value following the five-point scale on the General Assessment Form (1-accept to 5-not appropriate), comments that justify that judgment and/or suggest appropriate revisions. These comments are desirable even if the paper is not recommended for publication. One purpose of the refereeing process, and the one for which authors most often express their deep gratitude, is the collegial function of helping one another improve our scholarly work. If you wish to address some comments exclusively to the editors, please separate them from the main body of your comments and indicate that they are not intended for the author. Because marginal notes can sometimes be valuable for authors, your copy of the paper with marginal notes will be passed on to the author if sent back to us. However, your marginal notes do not substitute for completing a typewritten evaluation of the paper. Rest assured, the editors will not reveal the identity of any referee to the author of the paper.

4. Referees should return their summary judgment and comments no later than January 31, 2017. These may be submitted by email to Kevin Carnahan at kevin.m.carnahan@gmail.com

Criteria for Evaluation
The JSCE offers speedy publication of high quality work as a service to authors who have crafted papers for delivery at the annual meetings of the SCE/SJE/SSME, and as a service to the members of these Societies and of the larger academic community who benefit from the published presentation of these contributions to ethical inquiry. The editors' first objective, then, is to discern which of the papers, among those submitted for consideration, represent the most penetrating and fruitful contributions to our common enterprise of inquiry. The system of expert and editorial review developed by the editorial board has been put in place to ensure fairness and equity in the assessment of the quality of the papers available for publication.
Scholarly excellence is the primary consideration, but it is not the sole consideration. In selecting papers for publication, the editors and editorial board will undertake to be faithful to two additional board directives:

- To represent the full scope of the Society’s scholarly interests: theological, philosophical, historical, professional, and social ethics; primarily Christian ethics but also Jewish, Islamic, and comparative ethics. This representation will not be possible in any single issue, but the issues of the JSCE, taken together, should reflect this diversity.
- To provide a forum for the work of new scholars (those in the first five years or so beyond the dissertation) and for the articulation of emerging issues and perspectives. Some preference may be given to papers from new scholars or papers on particularly timely topics, but only within the guidelines concerning quality.

Therefore, please consider the following criteria when evaluating the paper:

1. **Does the paper make sense?** Is it clearly written and comparatively free of jargon? Are the distinctions crisp? Is the argument coherent and accessible? Does the paper offer a strong line of argument with appropriate support and adequate development? Is the argument complex, sophisticated, or unusually elegant?

2. **Is the paper competent?** The issue here is scholarly substance. Is the author familiar with the principal dimensions of the topic and with the established body of relevant literature? Does the author handle sources honestly, resourcefully, and without distortion? Has the author offered an even-handed treatment of the topic or do the author's own commitments bias the presentation in worrisome ways? If the author's position is controversial, does she or he position her or his work in the context of the current debate?

3. **Does the paper follow contemporary standards of language use?** The JSCE is committed to inclusive, non-discriminatory, and non-inflammatory language. Does the paper reflect in any way writing that is sexist, racist, homophobic, xenophobic, or otherwise derogatory of gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or religion?

4. **Does the paper reflect contemporary standards of diversity?** Does the paper follow the recommendations of the “Twenty-First Century Report” and the commitment of the JSCE Editorial Board to foster the dialogue among the diverse perspectives present in the SCE/SJE/SSME and to encourage deliberately this discourse through the critical and sustained engagement of the work of scholars who are currently underrepresented in the academy? Does the paper engage the work of emerging scholarship from, for example, Black and Womanist, Hispanic/Latina(o) and Mujerista, Asian and Asian American, and other context-based theologies? Does the paper include critical scrutiny and social/self-reflection of the racial, cultural, and/or religious implications for the subject, scholarship, or method of the investigation?

5. **Does the paper make a significant contribution?** Does it offer an analytic, creative, or constructive contribution to the field? Is the work original, provocative, or unusually incisive? Is the argument adventurous? Does it open new possibilities or raising a plausible challenge to the reigning consensus? Does the paper add to, rather than merely repeat, what is already available in the work of others?

6. **Does the paper advance interdisciplinary approaches and/or methodologies?** Has the author used another discipline’s hermeneutic to explore and value the questions of ethical inquiry? Does
the paper deliver insight from another discipline’s tools of investigation? Is the methodology sufficiently presented?

7. Is the paper of general interest? Does it address important ethical questions? Does it draw upon religious and theological resources in addressing these questions? Will the paper interest large numbers of the Society's members, however specialized its particular subject matter may be?

Form used to evaluate submitted manuscripts:

General Assessment of the Paper

Author of the Paper:

Title of the Paper:

PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE!

___ 1. Accept, no reservations: the paper is eminently publishable, a distinguished piece, major/important contribution to scholarship in the field, seminal.

___ 2. Accept, pending revision: the paper is definitely publishable with recommended changes or suggestions, or contingent on recommendation for specific revisions

___ 3. Consider: the paper makes a modest contribution to the field or displays a significant weakness with respect to one or more general criteria of selection, contingent on significant revision.

If you checked 2 or 3:
please include your recommendations for revisions that could raise the overall quality of the paper.

___ 4. Definitely not publishable: the paper fails to meet minimal standards for publication.

___ 5. Not appropriate for publication in the JSCE: the author might consider seeking publication in (please supply the name(s) of alternate journal(s) for the work).

Please include your comments on the paper and/or give grounds for your summary judgment below. Suggestions for revision are appropriate, encouraged, and appreciated whether or not you recommend publication. The editors will not reveal the identity of any referee to the author of the paper; your recommendations will be forwarded to the author in a JSCE-generated document for this purpose.

Reviewer’s name (print): _____________________________________________________________

Thank you.
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**D. Annual Meeting Appendices**

**Annual Meeting Appendix D.1:**

**Responsibilities of Presenters and Conveners**

**Concurrent Session Guidelines**

The aim of the concurrent sessions is to foster constructive dialogue among all present at a session. Here are some guidelines, which stem from a board-level discussion.

Concurrent sessions are 90 minutes long, allowing for 45 minutes of presentation and 45 minutes of discussion.

Presenters and conveners are asked to work together to insure a constructive and open discussion.

**Convener’s responsibilities:**

- Begin the session promptly.
- Announce if photography or recording is not allowed by the presenter. *NEW!*
- Keep the presenter on schedule; provide warnings as agreed upon with the presenter, but at least give a 10-minute, a 5-minute warning, and a 1-minute warning. *NEW!* Time cards are now available at the registration desk if you would like to use them at a session. Please pick up immediately before your session and return immediately following so they are available to others.
- Field questions and facilitate discussion following the presentation.
- Call on as many different individuals as possible during the 45 minutes set aside for discussion.
- Avoid letting one or two individuals dominate the discussion time
- Call on new members and junior scholars when possible

**Presenter’s responsibilities:**

- Limit your presentation to 45 minutes.
- Let the convener moderate the Q and A so you will not be distracted by trying to figure out the order in which hands were raised.
- When one or two individuals begin to dominate the discussion, assist the convener by inviting such individuals to speak to you at the conclusion of the session.
Annual Meeting Appendix D.2:
Interest Group Descriptions

African-American Approaches to Christian Ethics

This Interest Group provides a forum in which to discuss Christian morality from an African-American perspective. The group examines and discusses moral dilemmas that challenge and complicate the lives of the African-American community. The goals of the Group are: (1) to bring together different voices in the community with regard to a variety of issues, (2) to address problems peculiar to the Black community, (3) to analyze and to celebrate distinctive cultural practices and ways of living, (4) to develop public policy for addressing problems besetting the Black community, (5) to identify or develop better dialogue between Society members and the African-American Church, and (6) to develop a network among interested members. The group will identify specific areas of interest for each new meeting.

Anglican Theological Ethics

This Interest Group provides a forum for papers and conversations centering on the Anglican contribution to the field of Christian ethics or moral theology. Presentations and papers focus on historical and contemporary topics related to our general theme. Participants from all traditions who are interested in joining our discussion, or in offering a contribution, are most welcome. A subsidiary purpose of our group is to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas between persons who teach or work within Anglican ecclesial and educational institutions.

Animal Ethics

Animal studies (sometimes called human-animal studies) is steadily gaining traction in the academy as scholars of all stripes are no longer bracketing the “question of the animal” in their research. Theologians, philosophers, ethicists, and other scholars of religion are accordingly rethinking the place of nonhuman animals in their theorizing and in their communities as they reflect on the extent of human obligations to other animals, among other questions.

Officially launched in 2016 after an exploratory meeting in 2015, the Animal Ethics Interest Group is open to members of the SCE, SJE, and SSME and has been interreligious in orientation and scope from its inception. We meet to share our work with one another in the growing fields of “animal ethics” and “animals and religion,” to enhance our opportunities for collaboration, and to increase the visibility of and knowledge about animal ethics across our three societies.

Christian Ethics in Historical Context (formerly Christian Ethics and the Enlightenment)

Given the flood of recent work on the British Moralists, Kant, and the history of modern ethics more generally, now is an opportune moment for reassessment by both detractors and defenders of Enlightenment moral thought. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, understandings of natural law, rights, and virtue were transformed in ways that deeply shaped subsequent moral thought. Is Enlightenment moral thought to be rejected for its individualism, stress on autonomy, overreliance on reason, secularizing thrust? Is Enlightenment moral thought to be lauded for developing concepts of tolerance and individual rights which Christian ethics should embrace? Or do both of these positions rely on questionable characterizations of the period?
**Climate Justice**

The Climate Justice Interest Group (CJIG) facilitates scholarly, pedagogical, and practical conversations and discernments at the intersections of climate change and justice, from the unique viewpoints and capabilities of our scholarly bodies. In the first year of our seven-year charter (2016—Toronto), the CJIG session was hosted by the SJE and focused on justifications for, and feasibility of, “conference sabbatical” concepts, which are gaining increasing attention in scholarly bodies around the United States and globally. Future years’ meetings will continue this inquiry while also expanding to considerations of climate justice and race, as well as other topics.

**Comparative Religious Ethics**

The purpose of the Comparative Religious Ethics Interest Group is to encourage and facilitate the cross-cultural study of religion and morality within the SCE. The Group provides a forum for discussions of methodological, historical, and substantive issues in the comparative study of religious ethics, and it seeks to identify and develop resources for teaching in the fields of comparative ethics and world religions.

**Covenantal Ethics**

The Covenantal Ethics Interest Group continues its discussions of biblical, historical, theological, ethical, and social dimensions of the covenantal theme. We continue to be concerned with the fruitfulness of the covenantal theme for social ethics and the ways in which an ethical stance which takes covenant seriously may differ from some other prominent contemporary stances. All are welcome to participate.

**Environmental Ethics and Theology**

The Interest Group on Environmental Ethics and Theology is grounded in the conviction that the environmental challenge raises critical issues of faith and ethics for theological education. Participants network together to exchange syllabi, circulate available resources, and cooperate in efforts to build a more concerted response to the ecological crisis.

**Ethics and Catholic Theology**

The purpose of this group is to advance discussion in moral theology and social ethics by looking for new and fruitful sources. Its goal is to foster substantive theological discussion as it relates to the practice of moral theology and social ethics in the Catholic tradition. To this end, the group provides participants with an opportunity to reflect on how developments in Catholic theology can and should inform work in ethics.

**Ethics and Law**

The Ethics and Law Interest Group considers a wide range of interconnections between law and ethics, such as: theological and ethical assumptions that inform law; whether existing laws and court decisions are ethically justified; and whether laws or jurisprudential conventions should be changed.

**Ethics and Political Economy**
This Interest Group meets annually to broaden and deepen our understanding of the interaction of ethics and economics. Our normal procedure is to invite an outside scholar or practitioner (usually an economist from the local area of the SCE meeting) to speak on an agreed-upon topic and then to proceed with discussion of attendant descriptive and normative issues. This allows us to focus on a timely question and to engage with an economist or other expert whom most of us would otherwise know only through the written word.

**Ethics and Sexualities**

This group explores questions of sexuality and sexual relations from both contemporary and historical perspectives.

**Evangelical Ethics**

The goals of this Group are 1) to analyze evangelical contributions to Christian ethics, 2) to evaluate evangelical ethics in relation to other approaches, 3) to consider the ethical implications of evangelical theologies, 4) to bring ethical reflection to bear upon the evangelical subculture, and 5) to share approaches to teaching ethics in evangelical institutions.

**Families and the Social Order**

This group gathers members concerned with questions regarding both relationships internal to families, and those between families and the social order. Past agendas have included presentations and discussion on members' research, panels of representatives from church and public policy institutes concerned with children and families, and analyses of recent popular and scholarly publications concerning these issues.

**Fieldwork and Ethics**

The purpose of the Fieldwork and Ethics Interest Group is to explore the methodological challenges of conducting qualitative fieldwork and discuss how Christian ethicists are currently incorporating fieldwork and ethnography into the discipline of Christian ethics.

**Future Scholars**

The Future Scholars Interest Group seeks to provide a space for doctoral students to present their research to the Society of Christian Ethics and receive feedback from accomplished scholars in their professional guild. The Future Scholars Interest Group is open to any doctoral student member of the Society of Christian Ethics.

**Health Care Ethics**

The Health Care Ethics Interest Group meets each year to discuss ethical concerns in the general area of health care. Previous topics include access to health care, assisted suicide, and the approach taken by different faith traditions to theological reflection on health care issues. The group is open to anyone interested in any of these areas. Formal papers are not presented in the interest group, and the group encourages a significant amount of verbal and materials exchange among attendees.

**Interrupting White Privilege**
This group gathers members of the SCE, SJE, and SSME who are actively interested in probing the dynamics of white privilege and white racism in their work and lives, countering those dynamics, and teaching for critical consciousness and active resistance to white privilege and white racism.

**Latino(a) Christian Ethicists**

This group serves the purpose of focusing on interests of Latino(a) ethics.

**LGBT and Queer Studies in Ethics**

Thinkers of the rank of Erich Fromm and C. S. Lewis have declared that loving and nurturing relationships between persons of the same sex were not so much morally wrong as psychologically impossible. Recently, however, the ethical debate had shifted. Especially in the political struggles over the legalization of gay marriage, feminists and liberationists have sought to define the conditions under which gay relationships might be morally right, psychologically healthy and socially constructive. Just what, if anything, our churches can do to foster such conditions remains a complex issue with far-reaching implications.

**Literature and Literary Theory**

This group provides a forum for ethicists who are interested in (1) exploring literary works from a moral and religious point of view, (2) considering literary criticism as a genre of moral discourse, (3) evaluating various arguments that moral/ethical work is being done in literature that cannot be done in any other way, and (4) examining the relationship between the normative and the aesthetic. “Literature” is construed broadly to include sacred texts, film, and autobiography, as well as imaginative drama, narrative, and poetry. Plans include the development of resources to be made available on the interest group web page and the possible development of a volume for publication. All who are interested are welcome; prior expertise in literary studies is not required.

**Liturgy and Ethics**

Formed in response to growing interest in the role of worship in the Christian life, the Liturgy and Ethics group provides a working forum for those interested in such questions as 1) embodied participation in worship and the formation of disciples, 2) sacraments and moral life (e.g., Eucharist, baptism), 3) the impact of cultural forces on congregational worship and moral action, historically, and presently 4) constructive theological work on worship’s proper relation to the moral life 5) connections between specific ethical questions (bioethics, ecological ethics, etc.) and liturgy.

**Monetary Policy**

This Interest Group seeks to clarify the dynamics involved in the management of our little-understood money system, to recognize the enormous and pervasive power of the system, to discern the extent to which its impact could be made more beneficial, and to explore possibilities for bringing to public awareness these extremely important, but currently neglected issues.

**Moral Theory and Christian Ethics**

There is a diversity of moral ideas and theories used in religious ethics. Whether in social ethics, theological ethics, comparative religious ethics, or applied ethics, ethicists from a broad spectrum
of religious traditions and convictions all engage moral theories in one way or another. It is our
conviction that many differences in views on particular moral issues are at least partly due to
different understandings, critiques and affirmations of various moral theories. This interest group
is designed to provide a place for sustained discussion dedicated to critical reflection on both
classical and contemporary moral theories and on their use in religious ethics.

**Peace and War**

This group explores issues of war and peace that have appeared prominently in the program.
Delineation of the issues has changed over the years, including presentations on both theoretical
and policy/application topics. The perennial significance of issues of war and peace has taken on
particular existential force. The rise of what is called “4th generation” or asymmetrical warfare
presents a challenging context for thinking about and teaching Christian approaches to both war
and peace.

**Pedagogy**

This group provides a forum in which both newer and more experienced teachers/scholars can
learn from one another about teaching religious ethics courses more effectively. The major goal of
the session is to provide participants with ideas and practices that they can use in their own
courses. As always, our conversation includes the exchange of pedagogical strategies relevant to
the theme Participants are invited to bring something to share: a syllabus, case, exercise, or
teaching tip.

**Protestant Perspectives on the Natural Law**

The Protestant Perspectives on the Natural Law interest group provides a forum for discussing
how reflection on the natural law has been or should be regarded by those within Protestant
traditions. These historical, critical, and normative conversations offer intellectual focus to an area
of emerging scholarly interest. The group also serves as a venue for ecumenical exchange between
Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox Christians on a topic of perennial theological interest.

**Restorative Justice**

This interest group on Restorative Justice explores issues in this area that need the research and
reflection of Christian ethicists, especially issues at the intersection of judicial criminal trials,
forms of public truth-telling about atrocities undertaken by governments, and the restoration of
political community in the wake of such atrocities. The group shares knowledge of significant
work already being done in this area and encourages members to consider addressing some of the
pertinent issues in future SCE meetings.

**Scripture and Ethics**

This interest group has as its primary focus the relationship between Scripture and Ethics. Group
members receive a mailing from the conveners in late October giving details and suggestions for
preparatory reading for the upcoming meeting.

**Technology Ethics**

This interest group has as its primary focus the relationship between technology and ethics.
Annual Meeting Appendix D.3: A-V Contract with Presenters

Contract for SCE audio visual equipment usage:

The SCE is pleased to make available for your presentation an LCD projector at no charge. (Hotels typically charge several hundred dollars for the use of such projectors.). However, past experience suggests that you as presenter need to be made aware that you are completely responsible for safeguarding and using the equipment properly. Therefore, the SCE asks you to sign a contract indicating your acceptance of such responsibility. Only after this contract is received will your request for any and all SCE owned equipment be considered and approved.

As an SCE member requesting to use the SCE audio visual equipment, I agree to the terms below.

- I will be in the specified room at least 15 minutes prior to the beginning of the concurrent session.
- I will stay at least 15 minutes after the session ends before leaving the room where the equipment is located.
- During the duration of time the equipment is in my possession I am completely responsible for all damages, loss, or theft. This includes missing extension cords, connection cables, or any other damages to the equipment that occurs while it is in my possession.
- I will provide my own computer and all other connection devices required other than the standard cables that come with the AV equipment. This includes but is not limited to USB converters and any extension cords required to power my personal computer.
- I understand that the SCE will provide a projection screen.
- I understand that internet connection is not available in the meeting rooms unless I arrange and pay for the service with the hotel. Average cost is $275 per day per meeting room. New Orleans is an exception: their charge is $30 per day per meeting room plus service charge and tax.
- I understand that the person who delivers the equipment to me is not an AV specialist and is only responsible for delivering the equipment to my session room. He/She will not be responsible for ensuring that the computer and AV equipment are compatible. I am solely responsible for ensuring that my computer’s settings are set correctly. I will provide any and all AV technical expertise required. (This would include any consulting fees required from hotel AV staff on site.) By submitting this form I know that my computer is compatible with an LCD projector.
- Because I understand others may be on the waiting list for this equipment, I will notify the Executive Administrator prior to October 15 if I wish to withdraw my request.
- The SCE does not provide the technology to skype someone in to a meeting. Skyping is discouraged by the SCE Program Committee because of the unreliability of connection and the difficulty in interacting with the audience present.

____________________________________  __________
Please return form to Linda Schreiber, Society of Christian Ethics, PO Box 5126, St. Cloud MN 56302-5126; Fax: 320-252-6984; email: sce@scethics.org
Guidelines for Facilitating a Breakfast with an Author

Thank you for agreeing to facilitate a Breakfast with an Author session!

The session is scheduled for 90 minutes: 30 minutes for breakfast buffet followed by 60 minutes of discussion. If all are present and have finished their meals in less than 30 minutes, feel free to begin earlier.

*Please be reminded that all present must have purchased the breakfast; no exceptions.*

The discussion segment ordinarily is divided as follows:

- 3 minutes for general welcome and individual introductions.
- 5-10 minutes for the facilitator to summarize the book and introduce the author.
- 5 minutes for the author to respond to the summary.
- 40-45 minutes for general discussion.

Facilitators' responsibilities:

- Ask participants to introduce themselves – name and institution.
- Provide a brief summary of the book.
- Introduce author and invite author to respond to the summary.
- Facilitate the general discussion.
- Avoid letting one or two individuals dominate the discussion time.
- Five minutes before the end of the session, wrap up discussion and invite author to make a brief summary comment.

Authors' responsibilities:

- Before the session: provide the facilitator with a copy of the book by December 1, or as soon as the facilitator has been identified.
- At the session: keep opening comments (in response to summary) brief.
- Allow the facilitator to keep the discussion moving.
- Provide a brief summary comment at the end of the session.

Authors: If you would like your book to be considered for review in the *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*, mail a copy to:

Kathryn Blanchard  
*JSCE* Book Review Editor  
Alma College  
614 W Superior St  
Alma, MI 48801

*Return to Table of Contents*  
*Return to the Annual Meeting*
Annual Meeting Appendix D.5: Waiver Application

Working Groups Student Waivers Application

Name: ___________________________________________________
Institution: ________________________________________________
Year of Annual Meeting: ________________________________
PhD Student: □ Yes □ No
Employed Full Time: □ Yes □ No
Race/Ethnicity:
□ Arabic
□ Asian/Asian American
□ African/African American
□ Hispanic/Latino/a
□ Native American/Alaskan
□ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
□ White
□ Other: ____________________

Waivers Requested:
□ Registration Early Rate
□ Dues

Working Group:
□ African and African American
□ Latino/a
□ Asian and Asian American

By completing this form, I understand:

• I need already to be a provisional member or a student member of the Society of Christian Ethics.
• I need to apply each year for waivers and can do so for a maximum of four years.
• By accepting a waiver, I agree to participate in a working group by attending both their working and interest group sessions. If I fail to do so, I will need to pay the waived amount to SCE.
• If I register after November 30th, I need to pay the additional $55.
• I need to complete the registration form and pay for any meals/tours desired.

Deadline for waiver requests: December 25.
E. Policy Appendices

Policy Appendix E.1: 
Board Conflict of Interest Policy

Purpose

1. The purpose of this Board conflict of interest policy is to protect the Society’s interests when it is contemplating entering into a transaction or arrangement that might benefit the private interests of an officer or director of SCE or might result in a possible excess benefit transaction.

Definitions

1. Interested person -- Any director, principal officer, or member of a committee with governing Board delegated powers, who has a direct or indirect financial interest, as defined below, is an interested person.

2. Financial interest -- A person has a financial interest if the person has, directly or indirectly, through business, investment, or family:

   a. An ownership or investment interest in any entity with which has a transaction or arrangement,
   b. A compensation arrangement with SCE or with any entity or individual with which SCE has a transaction or arrangement, or
   c. A potential ownership or investment interest in, or compensation arrangement with, any entity or individual with which SCE is negotiating a transaction or arrangement.

   Compensation includes direct and indirect remuneration as well as gifts or favors that are not insubstantial. A financial interest is not necessarily a conflict of interest. A person who has a financial interest may have a conflict of interest only if the Board or Executive Committee decides that a conflict of interest exists, in accordance with this policy.

3. Independent Director -- A director shall be considered “independent” for the purposes of this policy if he or she is “independent” as defined in the instructions for the IRS 990 form or, until such definition is available, the director --

   a. is not, and has not been for a period of at least three years, an employee of SCE or any entity in which SCE has a financial interest;
   b. does not directly or indirectly have a significant business relationship with SCE, which might affect independence in decision-making;
   c. is not employed as an executive of another corporation where any of SCE’s executive officers or employees serve on that corporation’s compensation committee; and
d. does not have an immediate family member who is an executive officer or employee of SCE or who holds a position that has a significant financial relationship with SCE.

Procedures

1. Duty to Disclose -- In connection with any actual or possible conflict of interest, an interested person must disclose the existence of the financial interest and be given the opportunity to disclose all material facts to the Board or Executive Committee.

2. Recusal of Self – Any director may recuse himself or herself at any time from involvement in any decision or discussion in which the director believes he or she has or may have a conflict of interest, without going through the process for determining whether a conflict of interest exists.

3. Determining Whether a Conflict of Interest Exists -- After disclosure of the financial interest and all material facts, and after any discussion with the interested person, he/she shall leave the Board or Executive Committee meeting while the determination of a conflict of interest is discussed and voted upon. The remaining Board or Executive Committee members shall decide if a conflict of interest exists.

4. Procedures for Addressing the Conflict of Interest

   a. An interested person may make a presentation at the Board or Executive Committee meeting, but after the presentation, he/she shall leave the meeting during the discussion of, and the vote on, the transaction or arrangement involving the possible conflict of interest.
   
   b. The Chairperson of the Board or Executive Committee shall, if appropriate, appoint a disinterested person or committee to investigate alternatives to the proposed transaction or arrangement.
   
   c. After exercising due diligence, the Board or Executive Committee shall determine whether SCE can obtain with reasonable efforts a more advantageous transaction or arrangement from a person or entity that would not give rise to a conflict of interest.
   
   d. If a more advantageous transaction or arrangement is not reasonably possible under circumstances not producing a conflict of interest, the Board or Executive Committee shall determine by a majority vote of the disinterested directors whether the transaction or arrangement is in SCE's best interest, for its own benefit, and whether it is fair and reasonable. In conformity with the above determination, it shall make its decision as to whether to enter into the transaction or arrangement.

5. Violations of the Conflicts of Interest Policy

   a. If the Board or Executive Committee has reasonable cause to believe a member has failed to disclose actual or possible conflicts of interest, it shall inform the member of the basis for such belief and afford the member an opportunity to explain the alleged failure to disclose.
   
   b. If, after hearing the member's response and after making further investigation as warranted by the circumstances, the Board or Executive Committee determines the member has failed to disclose an actual or possible conflict of interest, it shall take appropriate disciplinary and corrective action.

Records of Proceedings
The minutes of the Board and all committees with Board delegated powers shall contain:

a. The names of the persons who disclosed or otherwise were found to have a financial interest in connection with an actual or possible conflict of interest, the nature of the financial interest, any action taken to determine whether a conflict of interest was present, and the Board's or Executive Committee's decision as to whether a conflict of interest in fact existed.

b. The names of the persons who were present for discussions and votes relating to the transaction or arrangement, the content of the discussion, including any alternatives to the proposed transaction or arrangement, and a record of any votes taken in connection with the proceedings.

Compensation

1. A voting member of the Board who receives compensation, directly or indirectly, from SCE for services is precluded from voting on matters pertaining to that member's compensation.

2. A voting member of any committee whose jurisdiction includes compensation matters and who receives compensation, directly or indirectly, from SCE for services is precluded from voting on matters pertaining to that member's compensation.

3. No voting member of the Board or any committee whose jurisdiction includes compensation matters and who receives compensation, directly or indirectly, from SCE, either individually or collectively, is prohibited from providing information to any committee regarding compensation.

Annual Statements

1. Each director, principal officer and member of a committee with Board delegated powers shall annually sign a statement which affirms such person:
   a. Has received a copy of the conflict of interest policy,
   b. Has read and understands the policy,
   c. Has agreed to comply with the policy, and
   d. Understands SCE is charitable and in order to maintain its federal tax exemption it must engage primarily in activities which accomplish one or more of its tax-exempt purposes.

2. Each voting member of the Board shall annually sign a statement which declares whether such person is an independent director.

3. If at any time during the year, the information in the annual statement changes materially, the director shall disclose such changes and revise the annual disclosure form.

4. The Executive Committee shall regularly and consistently monitor and enforce compliance with this policy by reviewing annual statements and taking such other actions as are necessary for effective oversight.

Periodic Reviews
To ensure SCE operates in a manner consistent with charitable purposes and does not engage in activities that could jeopardize its tax-exempt status, periodic reviews shall be conducted. The periodic reviews shall, at a minimum, include the following subjects:

a. Whether compensation arrangements and benefits are reasonable, based on competent survey information (if reasonably available), and the result of arm's length bargaining.

b. Whether partnerships, joint ventures, and arrangements with management organizations, if any, conform to SCE’s written policies, are properly recorded, reflect reasonable investment or payments for goods and services, further charitable purposes and do not result in inurement or impermissible private benefit or in an excess benefit transaction.

Use of Outside Experts

When conducting the periodic reviews, SCE may, but need not, use outside advisors. If outside experts are used, their use shall not relieve the Board of its responsibility for ensuring periodic reviews are conducted.

Board of Directors – REVIEW VERIFICATION

I have reviewed the “Annual Conflict of Interest Statement” and the 990 Return.

1. Name: ___________________________ Date: ________________

2. Name: ___________________________ Date: ________________

3. Name: ___________________________ Date: ________________

______________________________________________ Date: ________________

Signature of President

Date of Review by Executive Committee: ________________________________

Return to Table of Contents
Return to Governance and Management
Policy Appendix E.2: Professional Conduct Policy

https://scethics.org/about-sce/who-we-are/official-documents/standards-professional-conduct

Section 1: Aspirations and Values of the SCE

The purpose of the Society of Christian Ethics is to promote scholarly work in the field of Christian ethics and in the relation of Christian ethics to other traditions of ethics and to social, economic, political, and cultural problems; to encourage and improve the teaching of these fields in colleges, universities and theological schools; and to provide a community of discourse and debate for those engaged professionally within these general fields (Bylaws, Art. II). In pursuit of this purpose members of the Society have particular professional commitments and responsibilities.

As scholars in the field of ethics we hold ourselves to a standard of free, rigorous, and intellectually honest inquiry aiming to advance scholarship and moral understanding, especially in regard to theologically informed perspectives. Our examination of moral issues shall respect the dignity of persons whose practices and positions we study. Likewise, our engagement with other disciplines and ethical and religious traditions shall be conducted with the aim of mutual learning and understanding. We seek to promote critical and constructive understandings of justice, the well-being of society and the good of the wider creation.

As participants in institutions we will foster just relationships with their members and constituencies—especially students, graduate assistants, colleagues, staff, clients, and patients—as well as with the communities these institutions affect.

As educators we will strive to improve the methods and intellectual depth of our teaching. We will exercise our authority justly with concern for the development of our students, respecting their dignity and the boundaries appropriate to professional interaction.

As members of the Society we will conduct inquiry, debate and other interactions with colleagues openly, fairly, and respectfully. We will execute our duties competently and justly without prejudice toward those with different values and viewpoints. We will welcome and take action to ensure the full participation of new and junior members and those who bring new voices to our conversations.

Certain conduct so clearly affronts the dignity of persons that it contravenes the minimal conditions for participation in our profession. Accordingly, in activities that occur under the auspices of the Society we will neither practice nor tolerate any form of harassment or unjust discrimination, in deed or word, based on race, sex, nationality, ethnicity, religious community, sexual orientation, age, or disability. Neither will we practice or tolerate, in deed or word, behavior that displays disrespect for the personal integrity of others as they carry out their responsibilities within the Society. Nor will we practice nor tolerate plagiarism, copyright infringement, and unacknowledged use of the research of others (cf. Bylaws, Art. III, Sec. 3). Persons who engage in such conduct within the Society’s activities shall be subject to the grievance procedures the Society adopts, as explained below.

Section 2: Statement of Professional Conduct
The primary purpose of this document is to promote the commitments outlined in the paragraphs above by adopting standards for the professional conduct of our members, and setting forth a grievance procedure for their reinforcement. An expectation of employees and staff of the Society is that they will review and abide by these standards. These standards, organized under three headings (respect for difference, respect for personal integrity, and respect for intellectual integrity), aim to protect the goods of our Society, to protect members from being treated in such a way that they cannot enjoy the full benefits of membership and activity in the Society, and to educate all members about the standards of behavior that membership in our scholarly community requires.

It is our responsibility, as a community of professionals, to develop and sustain our own standards of conduct. We therefore publicize these commitments and standards, and commit to renewing them by regular examination and, if appropriate, revision. Questions and concerns, and especially reports and complaints of violations of professional conduct, will be listened to, taken seriously, and responded to fairly and constructively.

These standards apply to all members of the SCE when they are involved in meetings and activities directly connected with the Society’s work. These standards also will be shared with invited speakers and other non-members who register for SCE meetings. The Executive Director is responsible for providing copies of these standards to invited speakers and to non-members who register for SCE meetings, and to provide copies of these standards to employees and staff of the Society.

Further, in compliance with the 2010 IRS Form 990 and as the SCE practices sound governance that includes the exercise of prudent risk management, the Society has adopted a “Whistleblower Policy” in addition these Standards of Professional Conduct. The Whistleblower Policy is intended to encourage and enable members, staff, and others to report in good faith suspected or actual occurrences of illegal, unethical, or inappropriate behaviors and/or practices and to protect them from retaliation or retribution. For more information see the policy at https://scethics.org/whistleblower-policy.

A. Respect for difference

We commit ourselves to sustaining a secure and open environment for discussion in the public spaces of our Annual Meetings. We expect, from ourselves individually and each other, thoughtful and constructive analysis and reflection—discourse which serves to invite, rather than diminish or exclude, the participation of those to whom and about whom we are speaking. We respect each other through the civil language that we employ in panels, presentations and conversation. We recognize that vigorous expression of disagreement about ethical matters does not itself count as disrespect for difference; we commit ourselves to expressing even vigorous disagreement in a civil way.

Disrespect for difference occurs when members engage in insensitive and demeaning conduct, unjust discrimination based on race, sex, nationality, ethnicity, religious community, sexual orientation, age, or disability—in short, and any behavior which impedes particular individuals or groups from fully participating in and enjoying the life of the Society. Any words or actions of this sort violate this standard when they contribute to an atmosphere of intimidation, marginalization, or contempt.

B. Respect for personal integrity
We commit ourselves to honoring the physical, moral, and sexual integrity of all SCE members. In all of our professional interactions connected with the SCE, we will treat fellow members and guests with the equal regard due to them as fellow human beings and fellow professionals, according to the norms of justice, honesty, fairness, dignity, and care. We recognize that each of us has a right to claim our own physical safety and security, as well as to make our own decisions and keep our own commitments in matters concerning romantic and sexual relationships. Participation in the roles, activities, and events of the SCE should depend solely upon professional interest and competence. No one’s claim to participation should be conditioned upon a threat, implicit or explicit, to her/his personal integrity.

_Disrespect for personal integrity_ can take several different forms in the context of SCE meetings, particularly in the context of the Annual Meeting at a hotel. The use of hotel bedrooms for professional purposes can create the appearance of a threat to personal integrity. Consequently, such private rooms should not be used for functions appropriate to public spaces, such as interviews, meetings or official SCE social gatherings. In public spaces, disrespect is expressed through: remarks, jokes or behavior which belittle, bully, harass, or exploit other members; the display or use of degrading or pornographic images for purposes unconnected to a professional presentation; the expression of lewd remarks or conduct; and the surreptitious administration of alcohol or drugs to reduce sexual inhibitions. As teachers and scholars of ethics, we are particularly sensitive to the way in which differentials of power and position, such as those between students and teachers or junior colleagues and senior colleagues, can create or exacerbate threats to personal integrity. Unwelcome sexual advances, including unwanted touching, violate the integrity of both parties. Likewise, persistent and unwelcome social invitations threaten to violate personal integrity, particularly when the intent is to extract sexual favors in exchange for professional advantage.

**C. Respect for intellectual integrity**

No scholarly progress can be made without freedom of thought, speech, and publication. The Society encourages its members to formulate and present their ideas, arguments, and research with freely exercised imagination and responsibility, in accordance with respect for persons and standards of professional judgment. Good scholarly work requires a high degree of discretion exercised by members in determining the appropriate context and presentation of academic material. This norm applies to both oral and written form. Respect for intellectual integrity also requires us to accurately present the work of other scholars with whom we are in conversation, particularly if we disagree with them. Finally, we must appropriately acknowledge our debt to the scholarly endeavors of others, by citing them fully and fairly in accordance with prevailing scholarly standards. Respect for intellectual integrity consists in protecting the conditions for and honoring the fruits of the vocation to scholarship, in order to facilitate a creative, honest, and rigorous scholarly conversation.

_Disrespect for intellectual integrity_ can be expressed in several ways. Three of the more egregious kinds of violations include incidents where: 1) a member or members intimidate, ridicule or otherwise inhibit without cause others from a full and genuine expression of their ideas especially in contexts where there are power differentials between scholars; 2) a member presents the ideas or positions of another scholar or source in a willfully or negligently incomplete or biased way; and 3) a member misrepresents the ideas from a source as his or her own by willfully or negligently failing to acknowledge the source in accordance with prevailing scholarly standards.
The list is meant to be illustrative rather than exhaustive, and the possible violations are framed in a general way so as to allow appropriate latitude for a determination to be made as to whether a given incident constitutes a violation.

Section 3: The Grievance Process

A. The Purpose of the Grievance Process

The grievance process provides structure and guidance for responding to evident or alleged violations of professional conduct. The process may be applied only to grievances between members of the SCE, that is, to members of the SCE aggrieved by the conduct of fellow members in the context of meetings and activities directly connected with the Society’s work.

The process is intentionally flexible, allowing considerable scope for discretionary exercise of its provisions in response to morally relevant differences in particular cases, such as the gravity of alleged misconduct and whether or not misconduct was intentional. The overarching goal is to reestablish a respectful and just environment for inquiry and discourse at SCE meetings. Where possible, the process should aim at achieving reconciliation on fair terms. In some cases, the duty to maintain the values and commitments of the SCE may require the application of sanctions (e.g., suspension or expulsion). Any intervention should aim at supporting and strengthening the SCE’s efforts to safeguard respect for difference, personal integrity, and intellectual integrity.

B. The Professional Conduct Committee

The Board of Directors of the SCE authorizes the PCC to interpret and apply the grievance process; to evaluate complaints brought under it; and to make recommendations to the Board in response to such complaints.

Each year the President shall appoint two members to the PCC for three-year terms, totaling six members and chaired by one of the members. The President also shall appoint the chair for the coming year. Terms of outgoing committee members end at the conclusion of the Business Meeting at the next year’s Annual Meeting. If a case is pending, the chair will continue until its resolution. Since respect for intellectual integrity requires vigilance, sensitivity and courage to identify and remedy infractions, the members of the PCC should be chosen for their practical wisdom. They should be seasoned members of the SCE, who possess sound and sober judgment, as well as tact, discretion, and skill with people. In aggregate, they should represent the SCE community in all its diversity. Members of the PCC are encouraged to take relevant training for their role at their home institution or elsewhere if it is available to them. Allowing for the possibility of a conflict of interest between a member of the PCC and a member against whom an allegation has been submitted or a member who has submitted a grievance, that member of the PCC will acknowledge the conflict and recuse herself/himself from case review and deliberations over intervention if any are forthcoming.

The PCC will review cases of alleged misconduct arising within the formally constituted activities of the SCE if it deems the grievance process of peer inquiry to be an appropriate means to address the allegation. The PCC will not further inquire into complaints it deems capricious or principally vindictive upon initial receipt, nor will it attempt to obviate or preempt civil or legal proceedings, nor will it, except in unusual circumstances, pursue a case while the dispute is pending in another forum. Review of and/or inquiry into a complaint by the PCC should not be regarded as a substitute for legal action.
C. The Grievance Procedure

The Grievance Procedure is designed for use during or soon after a formally constituted event of the SCE. The swift passage of such events imposes limitations on the PCC’s ability to obtain information, provide due process, protect confidentiality, and resolve the case with effective mediation or appropriate sanctions. Therefore, members are encouraged to notify the PCC with complaints as soon after the event(s) as is possible.

The parties of a grievance are: Complainant(s), Respondent(s), Chair (of PCC), Representative (of PCC), and the PCC.

i. The Initial stage

A member should bring a grievance directly to the chair of the PCC, who ensures that all inquiries and complaints are properly undertaken and concluded. If any member of the PCC is named in the complaint, he or she will not participate in deliberation of the case. No person who has been accused in a complaint will participate in the inquiry or resolution of the complaint.

When a grievance is brought to the chair of the PCC, the chair shall promptly assign a member of the PCC to handle the case as its representative. The representative is charged with conducting a preliminary inquiry to determine if the allegation grieved warrants further inquiry. The representative will first, contact the complainant to gather relevant details and, if the representative deems it right, second, gather relevant details from the member against whom a complaint has been made.

In some situations, the representative may find that an informal conversation with the complainant and the respondent suffices to determine what happened and then to resolve a hurtful misunderstanding or repair an unintentional offense through mediation. If the mediation is successful, no written record shall be generated. The representative shall orally inform the chair of the successful resolution of the incident.

For example, under Respect for Difference, if a member of the SCE uses a derogatory racial term in a conversation at the hotel bar, but doesn’t realize the term is offensive, the representative may explain its offensiveness, the respondent may understand, and a sincere apology may be all that is required. Under Respect for Personal Integrity, a request for some form of sexual intimacy that was honestly but mistakenly believed to be welcome might be settled with a sincere apology. Or, as another example, under Respect for Intellectual Integrity, using material from the writings of another without proper citation in an essay the respondent publishes in the Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics, but unintentionally and in a minor way, might be resolved with a sincere apology and a note of correction to be included in the Co-Editors’ Preface in the next issue of the JSCE.

A more formal procedure will be required if mediation fails or if the representative judges that the grieved offense was deliberate and/or serious enough to require more attention. The representative shall ask the complainant whether he or she wishes to proceed further, and shall ordinarily respect the complainant’s wishes in this regard ordinarily by referring the complaint to the PCC. However, in cases it deems sufficiently serious, the PCC reserves the right to pursue the inquiry independent of the complainant’s participation. In these cases, the PCC will consult with officers of the Society about how to proceed.

If the complainant chooses to proceed, the representative shall inform the chair, who should promptly convene the committee, by telephone if need be, to evaluate the complaint. By majority
vote, the PCC may decide either to accept the complaint for further inquiry or to decline to consider it. This decision should be based upon:

- a judgment of the resources and competence of the PCC to handle the matter;
- the seriousness of the complaint;
- the degree to which the complaint alleges specific violations of the SCE Declaration of Professional Commitments;
- sufficient evidence to proceed with further inquiry;
- the availability of a more suitable forum, such as a university grievance procedure or the AAUP.

If the PCC decides to decline consideration of the complaint, the representative will explain the decision to the complainant, and the respondent if aware of the complaint. No written record will be kept of the complaint or the PCC’s decision not to consider the case.

Note: The PCC will protect the privacy of both the complainant and the respondent in every way possible during the process of the complaint and thereafter. However, all parties should realize that the confidentiality of the SCE proceeding is not protected against legally mandated disclosure if it falls within the scope of a subsequent lawsuit.

ii. Pursuing a complaint

If the PCC decides to pursue the complaint with the complainant’s participation, the representative will promptly and impartially solicit 1) a signed, written statement from the complainant (if the complaint was made to the chair verbally). The statement will be furnished to the respondent, with a request for 2) a written response. The representative may solicit additional relevant evidence, including from others not necessarily aware of the complaint; the solicitation of comments from witnesses shall be done delicately and with circumspection. The representative will write 3) a report of the inquiry detailing additional evidence in the case.

The PCC will then meet in person or by conference call to consider the case, including the statements by the complainant and the respondent, and the report on the inquiry and any recommendations by the representative.

iii. Possible outcomes of the grievance procedure

a) The PCC might conclude that there is insufficient evidence of violation to warrant any action, and therefore officially close the investigation. The chair shall so notify the complainant and the respondent. No written record will be maintained of the incident.

b) The PCC might conclude that a violation has occurred. If the PCC does so, it shall write a letter of reprimand to the respondent and suggest a sanction to the Board, if it deems a sanction to be warranted. Recommendations for sanctions are determined by a majority vote of the PCC (excluding the representative).

c) Possible sanctions include:
   1. Requiring the offender to undergo some sort of education regarding the Society’s professional commitments and appropriate and inappropriate behaviors, and to provide documentation to the PCC that this training has been completed. Failure to comply may result in the rescinding of membership.
   2. Recommendation to the Board to suspend, restrict, or terminate the membership of the respondent, in accordance with Article III, Section 7 of the Bylaws.

d) If a sanction is recommended, the chair shall prepare a written report justifying the proposed action. This report should include, as appendices, the statements of the complainant and
respondent, as well as the representative’s report of the inquiry. This report goes to the Board for further action.

e) If the recommendation to the Board is made to suspend, restrict, or terminate membership (3.C.2), the following additional procedures must be followed.

1. The PCC shall provide the Board with copies of the chair’s report, including all appendices (3.D).
2. The complainant and respondent will be provided a copy of the chair’s report, including all appendices. They will be offered an opportunity to make a written response to the Board on the PCC’s recommendation.
3. The sanction of suspension or restriction requires a majority vote of the Board of Directors. The sanction of expulsion requires a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Board. The vote of the Board is final.
4. The President shall notify the complainant and the respondent of the Board’s decision in writing.

iv. Records

a) The PCC will create a file for each case it has pursued.
b) For each case in which a violation has been found to have occurred, the Executive Director shall maintain in the office file one copy of the complete case file, which includes the chair’s report, including all appendices (3.D). If applicable, it shall also include additional materials submitted to the Board, and the written decision of the Board.
c) These documents shall be made available only to those who serve in the office of President, the Executive Director, and the Chair of the PCC, and shall be destroyed in five year’s time of filing.
d) All other copies shall be destroyed immediately after the PCC or Board meetings dealing with the case have concluded.

D. After the Grievance Process

The determinations and recommendations rendered by the PCC are final, and may not be appealed by the complainant, respondent or a third party to the Board or to the entire membership except when those determinations result in the Board’s decision to suspend, restrict, or terminate membership as set forth in Article III.7 of the Bylaws, which decision may be appealed to the Board.

1. If it is discovered that anyone—complainant, respondent, or third party—knowingly provided false information regarding a case. The SCE prohibits the use of false testimony, and the PCC or the Board may take disciplinary action against the offending party.
2. If retaliation is taken against any member, or against an employee of SCE filing a complaint against a member, or against the person accused. The SCE prohibits such retaliation, and the PCC or the Board may take additional disciplinary action against the one who retaliates.
3. If the confidences of the complainant, the respondent, or other parties directly involved are abused by the members of the PCC or the Board. The SCE prohibits disclosure of confidential material unless required by law or to protect the safety of a party or a third person. Violations of confidence may warrant additional sanctions by the PCC or the Board. Whether or not these misuses of the grievance procedure exacerbate the original complaint, they are themselves violations of respect for personal and intellectual integrity, and so are subject to the same disciplinary standards.

E. PCC Annual Report to the Board
The chair is the official liaison to the Board, President, and Executive Director and must report every inquiry and formal complaint. The chair shall prepare a written annual report to the Board, describing the cases it has received during the previous year in the following way:

1. The chair shall identify the number and general type of cases resolved by a PCC member on an informal basis.
2. The chair shall describe in general terms, which omit all direct and indirect identification of the parties involved, each case the PCC declined to consider.
3. The chair shall prepare an abbreviated version of the case report of each case the PCC decided to give full consideration, omitting all direct and indirect identification of the parties involved.

F. PCC Annual Report to the Membership

The chair shall prepare a short oral report, to be given at the Annual Meeting, summarizing the annual report to the Board, but identifying cases, resolved or declined, only according to the kind of violation involved (regarding disrespect for difference, personal integrity, or intellectual integrity).
Policy Appendix E.3: Whistleblower Policy

https://scethics.org/about-sce/who-we-are/official-documents/standards-professional-conduct

This policy is intended to encourage members, staff (paid and volunteer) and others having business with the Society to report suspected or actual occurrence(s) of illegal and unethical events (behaviors or practices) without retribution.

1. The Whistleblower should promptly report the suspected or actual event to President of the organization.

2. If the Whistleblower would be uncomfortable or otherwise reluctant to report to the President, then the Whistleblower could report the event to another officer of the Society or to a Board Member.

3. The Whistleblower can report the event with his/her identity or anonymously.

4. The Whistleblower shall receive no retaliation or retribution for a report that was provided in good faith—that was not done primarily with malice to damage another or the organization.

5. A Whistleblower who makes a report that is not done in good faith is subject to discipline, including termination of the Board, member or employee relationship, or other legal means to protect the reputation of the organization and members of its Board and staff.

6. Anyone who retaliates against the Whistleblower (who reported an event in good faith) will be subject to discipline, including possible termination of membership or of Board or employee status.

7. Crimes against person or property, such as assault, rape, burglary, etc., should immediately be reported to local law enforcement personnel.

8. The President or other Officer or Board member who receives a report must act promptly to deal with the report in a manner consistent with the law and the SCE’s Professional Conduct Policy, if applicable to the case at hand.

9. The President or other Officer or Board Member receiving the complaint, the chair of the Professional Conduct Committee, and the Executive Director together shall determine the best way to proceed with the inquiry. If any of the above persons are the subjects of the complaint, they shall be replaced. The President shall be replaced by the Officer or Board member to whom the original report was made. The chair of the Professional Conduct Committee shall be replaced by the next senior member of the Professional Conduct Committee. The Executive Director shall be replaced by another member of the Board, appointed by the President or other officer in the President’s stead.

10. The Whistleblower shall receive a report within thirty (30) days of the initial report, regarding the ongoing inquiry, disposition or resolution of the issue.

11. If the inquiry of a report that was done in good faith and completed by internal personnel is not to the Whistleblower’s satisfaction, then he/she has the right to report the event to the appropriate legal or investigative agency.

12. The identity of the Whistleblower, if known, shall remain confidential to those persons directly involved in applying this policy. If the matter is referred for investigation by law enforcement, members of the organization are subject to subpoena. If the matter is deemed to fall within the purview of the Professional Conduct Committee, the Grievance Process outlined in the Standards of Professional Conduct will apply.
Policy Appendix E.4:  
Policy for Web Access and List Serve

https://scethics.org/policies-and-procedures

Introduction

The purpose of the Society of Christian Ethics is “to promote scholarly work in the field of Christian ethics and in the relation of Christian ethics to other traditions of ethics and to social, economic, political, and cultural problems; to encourage and improve the teaching of these fields in colleges, universities and theological schools; and to provide a community of discourse and debate for those engaged professionally within these general fields.” (SCE Bylaws, Article II.) “The Society will conduct all its business in a manner appropriate to its purposes.” (SCE Bylaws, Article II. Section 3).

The primary way that SCE creates and supports this community of discourse and debate is through the planning of the Annual Meeting where scholars meet in person to present papers, listen to papers, and engage in conversations during and after formal conference sessions. While SCE has begun a process of adapting to the digital age and making use of the available technologies to foster a community of discourse year-round via online means of communication, at all times such communication must align with the purposes of the Society. Unlike some professional organizations that regularly issue policy reports or white papers (for example, the American Academy of Pediatrics), the SCE does not publish policy reports. We urge the Board to focus primary attention on the Annual Meeting as the vehicle for building a community of discourse in Christian Ethics.

As the SCE has grown and evolved, some questions have surfaced regarding the appropriate use of technology and online platforms for SCE communication. The Board has approved the development and maintenance of a website and the Board has begun a process of communicating with members primarily via email communication instead of postal mail. There is a financial benefit to this transition away from postal mail as the primary mode of official correspondence, and yet members are sensitive to the fact that new questions emerge in this process. The Board has approved the following in an effort to help the SCE move more smoothly into this new era of online communication.

1. SCE will continue the transition to email as primary mode of official correspondence with members. Every effort will be made to keep member email lists updated. The SCE will only use member emails for official SCE correspondence (for example, the Call for Proposals and the Call to Meeting, etc). Member email lists will not be sold to third-party customers like publishers. All official SCE emails will be easily identified as official SCE business (emails should come from sce@scethics.org or a similar email address and if possible the logo of the SCE and the name of the author of the email- ideally an officer or employee- should appear in the top line of the email). All other email correspondence will result from a member decision to opt in to email communication (for example, signing up with a particular interest group or working group- see #4 below for more on this).

2. SCE will continue to sell the SCE mailing list (mailing addresses, not emails) of members to interested third parties (publishers, academic programs, conferences, etc- not to individuals).
3. Announcements or advertisements from third-party vendors or SCE members will not be distributed in the registration packet at the meeting. However, there will be a table and bulletin board in a central location so that members can post or distribute materials at their own expense. This space will be labeled with a disclaimer (for example: “This bulletin board enables members to post materials of interest to other members, but no materials here have received the official endorsement of the SCE.”) The Annual Meeting program will encourage members to take advantage of this space for this purpose (to prevent flyers from being distributed in other meeting spaces).

4. Some member groups conduct various kinds of business (networking, mentoring, research assistance, etc) by email and online in between Annual Meetings. The SCE website has been constructed to facilitate this as smoothly as possible. The SCE website will facilitate these methods of communication as much as possible. Members should give feedback to the Executive Administrator about suggestions for website improvements.

Currently, Interest Groups/Working Groups/Caucuses each have a page on the website. When the website is working properly, the group page has the following features:
1. Any member of the group can post on the page.
2. Anyone logged into the website can view postings, not just members of the group.
3. Conveners of the group can edit any postings.
4. Conveners can send emails to members of the group through the website page.

In order for this space to be used productively, regular maintenance of the website will be performed and updates will make the platform as user-friendly as possible. Additionally, a disclaimer will be placed at the top of the page when the user navigates to the “Group” page, saying the following: “SCE Group Conveners are responsible for the content on these pages. The information here is not endorsed by the SCE but is made available to members by members.”

5. In limited cases group reports have been made available via email and/or posting to the “Official Documents” tab of the website, but only when the substance of the report was aligned with the mission and purpose of the Society and a procedure was in place to approve the report. Two such examples include the following:
1. The Women’s Caucus drafted and approved the document “Enabling a Family Friendly Institution: Creative Practices.” This report was approved by the membership at the Business Meeting during the 2009 Annual Meeting, and was afterwards posted on the website under “Official Documents.”
2. The Board established the SCE 2020 Committee on The Future of Christian Ethics during the 2011 meeting, and made the report of the committee available to the membership prior to the 2014 Annual Meeting.

There is not precedent for enabling groups to distribute reports to the entire membership without a formal review and approval by the membership or the Board. The SCE Board discourages members from submitting reports with the expectation that they be distributed to the SCE membership. If a member or a group wishes to submit such a report, the substance of the report must be aligned with the mission and purpose of the Society. The report must first be approved by the Board and then by the membership before it is to be made available as an “Official Document” on the SCE website.

Approved by the SCE Board, January 2015 at the SCE Annual Meeting
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Appendix F.1:
Report of the 21st Century Committee

https://scethics.org/about-sce/21st-century-initiatives

Background Report of the Committee for the Twenty-first Century Society of Christian Ethics

History. The Committee for the Twenty-First Century was initiated by President Ronald M. Green as communicated in a letter to the members of the Society of Christian Ethics, dated October 16, 1998. The stated purpose of the committee was to think about the current status and future directions of the Society as its members approached the beginning of a new millennium and the fortieth anniversary of the Society. The committee was charged by President Green to address the evolving needs of our scholarly field by considering the following and related issues: the Society’s mission, likely changes in size and membership base, format of the Annual Meeting, governance structure, and access to new communication technologies to enhance the work of the Society. President Green invited all members of the Society to nominate Society members for service on this committee and to send nominations to him or to Dennis McCann, Executive Director. The Committee was asked to express its work in the form of recommendations.

Membership. The members of the committee, approved by the Board of Directors at the 1999 Annual Meeting, are these: June O’Connor, Chair; Timothy Beach-Verhey, Frederick Bird, Audrey Chapman, Miguel De La Torre, Ronald M. Green, Christine Gudorf, Simeon Ilesanmi, Timothy Jackson, John Langan, Dennis McCann, Gene Outka, William Schweiker, Ruth Smith, Emilie Townes, Cristina Traina, Darryl Trimiew, Sumner Twiss, Louke Van Wensveen, Allen Verhey, and Sondra Wheeler.

Committee Work. The Committee for the Twenty-First Century had its first meeting September 24-26, 1999 at the Illinois Conference Center in Zion, Illinois, using this time to raise questions and brainstorm possibilities. At June O’Connor’s request, Dennis McCann reported on the makeup of the Society, given the limited data base of information then available, and Ronald Green presented a report on the history of the Society. As a result of the brainstorming processes, four subcommittees emerged. One (Louke Van Wensveen, Chair, John Langan, Vice Chair) had as its task to think about the ways in which the SCE has been effective and productive in the course of its life and what it might do to sustain and improve its efficacy. A second (Emilie
Townes, Chair, Frederick Bird, Vice Chair) focused on ways in which the SCE might extend and enhance its work by fostering formal and informal relationships with other individuals, societies, and agencies that do work in the fields of ethics. A third (Ruth Smith, Chair, Cristina Traina, Vice Chair) sought to articulate the questions that are evoking moral thought in our time. A fourth (Christine Gudorf, Chair) had as its task the design of a survey instrument that would poll the members and provide a data base of information useful to the committee and to the future. The survey was sent to Society members in November, 1999, and the results tabulated in March, 2000.

The Committee for the Twenty-First Century met again at the Society’s Annual Meeting in Arlington, Virginia, January 7-9, 2000. A meeting of the committee was held Saturday night, January 8, 2000 at the Hyatt Regency Crystal City Hotel. A Closing Plenary Session on Sunday, January 9, provided a forum for informing the SCE members of the committee’s work to date and inviting participation in further brainstorming procedures relevant to the committee’s charge. Interim subcommittee reports were presented to those assembled, followed by “breakout” discussion sessions designed to encourage wide participation of Society members. Notes were taken, reports were submitted to the Chair, and suggestions were considered during committee deliberations that led to the final recommendations. A similar brainstorming session had been conducted with the Pacific Section of the SCE when that section had its Annual Meeting in Pasadena at Fuller Theological Seminary on February 19, 1999.

The committee conducted its final meeting September 22-24, 2000 at the Harrington Conference Center of Columbia Theological Seminary in Decatur, Georgia. The chief agenda item was to formulate recommendations to be sent to the Board of Directors and Society members for attention at the Annual Meeting, 2001.

Throughout its brainstorming processes and deliberations, the Committee addressed a wide variety of questions and concerns. One of these pertained to the name of the Society of Christian Ethics. Some members of the Society at large had expressed to individual committee members an interest in retaining the name as is, while others advised a change to the “Society of Christian and Comparative Ethics” and still others recommended the “Society of Religious Ethics.” It was also suggested that the Society of Christian Ethics foster the establishment of a sister society, The Society of Religious Ethics, that the Annual Meetings of these two societies overlap, and that ethicists doing work in the ethics of Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh, and other traditions be recruited for membership in the new sister society. In the end, the Committee for the Twenty-First Century chose to place its attention on the practices of the Society rather than on the name of the Society and to foster the particular practice of expanding our ethical conversations with ethicists in other cultures, traditions, and institutional settings. Our thinking in this regard is reflected in section five of the Report of Recommendations. Since the majority of our membership does research in “Christian ethics and in the relation of Christian ethics to other traditions of ethics and to social, economic, political, and cultural problems” (Bylaws, Article II), as is evident in the findings of the 1999-2000 poll, it was clear to our committee that as a Society we are, in fact, a community of scholars with a preeminent expertise and focus on Christian ethics and its relations to various problems and other traditions. If these interests and our members’ range of expertise should alter significantly over time, our identity would thereby change, and a name change would more appropriately be considered at that time.

With the submission of this Background Report and the Report of Recommendations, the work of the Committee for the Twenty-First Century is completed.

Reports submitted by June O’Connor, Chair
on behalf of the Members of the Committee for the Twenty-First Century
October 10, 2000

Report of Recommendations
The Committee for the Twenty-First Century begins its report by noting the ways in which the Society of Christian Ethics has effectively carried out its purposes as identified in Article II of the Bylaws. Article II states: "The purpose of the Society shall be to promote scholarly work in the field of Christian ethics and in the relation of Christian ethics to other traditions of ethics and to social, economic, political, and cultural problems; to encourage and improve the teaching of these fields in colleges, universities and theological schools; and to provide a community of discourse and debate for those engaged professionally with these general fields." As indicated by our review of the 1999-2000 membership poll, the Society has been particularly effective in providing a context for the professional development of its members and a stimulating environment through which members stay informed of new developments in the field, inform and assist one another in a collegial setting, and offer high quality papers in many areas.

The Society has effectively investigated a variety of ethical issues, approaches, and resources, such as historical and methodological issues in ethics and the relationships between scripture and ethics, theology and ethics, feminism and ethics, and the like. In addition to valuing these lines of inquiry and analysis, the Committee for the Twenty-First Century and the membership’s stated interests in the 1999-2000 poll affirm the importance of attending to new patterns of and shifting perspectives on globalization. Among the many themes inviting fresh thought, the Committee encourages attention to identity shifts in the face of migration and the relocation of cultures and religions, freedom and justice in the face of inter- and intra-state conflict, on the one hand, and in light of the power of the media, free trade, and global advertising, on the other. Economic impacts on the workforce and workplace, on professional and personal interactions, and on issues of survival, sustainability, and flourishing call for attention. As ethicists, we wish always to be alert to new as well as familiar ways of moral thinking, imagining, and assessing, and of re-thinking and re-imagining the audiences with whom we explore ethical concerns. We recognize the importance of listening to unfamiliar voices and being attentive to the power relations embedded in moral discourse itself, both within our own communities and in relation to other communities.

Given our involvements in a field of inquiry that constantly challenges us to enrich our work, and given the availability of new communication technologies, we make the following recommendations concerning 1) questions and concerns evoking moral thought in our time, 2) the Society’s administration, 3) Society activities, 4) Society structures, and 5) ways in which we might expand our conversations to include ethicists in other traditions, cultures, and institutional settings.

1. **Recommendations Regarding Questions and Concerns**

1a. *That the Society invite papers and other presentations on critical and self-critical thinking about issues of globalization.*

1b. *That the Society foster scholarly analysis and invite presentations on the ethical implications of scientific and technological developments in our time.*
1c. Given the pluralistic setting of scholarly work in ethics, that the Society foster critical thinking and invite papers on the distinctiveness of Christian ethics and on religious moral identities in the new millennium.

1d. That the Board of Directors establish a committee to develop guidelines expressing the Society’s relationship to various religious traditions and institutions, given the relationship between the churches and academic bodies (universities, colleges, and seminaries) regarding research and teaching of ethics; and that the committee consider ways in which the Society might assist members who are facing critical conflicts between the two.

2. Recommendations Regarding Society Administration

2a. That the Society through its Executive Director employ online technologies to enhance scholarly, pedagogical, and business communications. Useful contents would include the following:

- A website with the SCE statement of purpose and membership information
- Email and listserv access
- Bulletin board discussion groups
- A program of the most recent and forthcoming Annual Meetings that can be downloaded
- A directory of members that can be searched but not downloaded
- Information on the Annual and how to subscribe
- The most recent Presidential Address
- Dates and locations of related meetings
- Links to related websites

It is hoped that these services will be available at the earliest possible date.

2b. That the Board of Directors establish a structure to explore the implications of online technologies for professional development, knowledge about intellectual property rights, justice in the exchange of information and interpretation, and related issues.

3. Recommendations Regarding Activities of the Society

3a. That the Board of Directors institutionalize mechanisms for encouraging and recognizing the achievement of SCE members in connection with its activities: e.g., sponsoring an annual Student Essay Competition, and other kinds of awards. The Board of Directors should establish policies about such awards and the Executive Director should consult with the Board about additional necessary resources.

3b. That the Board of Directors appoint a committee to investigate the feasibility and wisdom of fund-raising for initiatives recommended in this report and other society activities, and that this committee provide an initial report to the Board in January, 2002. This committee is urged to give special attention to seeking funding for recommendations 5a and 5c of this report.

3c. That beginning in 2002, the schedule of the Annual Meeting be redesigned and lengthened by including Friday morning for concurrent sessions, interest groups, panels, seminars,
contacts with local communities, and other activities; and that the use of the Sunday morning

time slots be revised to make room for concurrent sessions or other meeting formats, including

special opportunities, as meeting locations warrant. [The Committee for the Twenty-First

Century voted 14 in favor, 5 against extending the meeting to include Friday morning; the

vote in favor of using the Sunday closing plenary session for other purposes was unanimously

supported by the Committee (19 in favor, 0 opposed).] We recommend that at least some

interest group time slots be integrated into the overall programming throughout the day. We

also recommend that the Friday plenary continue to be scheduled in the early afternoon time

frame as has been customary. These changes are recommended as ways of accommodating

our increasing numbers as a society and in light of our committee’s recommendations

pertaining to new mechanisms for sharing knowledge.

3d. That beginning in 2002 both conveners and respondents be assigned to sessions in which

single papers are presented. The convener’s task would be to introduce the speakers, monitor

time, and coordinate questions. The respondent’s task would be to provide brief (5-7 minute)

remarks that raise constructive questions or provide resources to strengthen the argument of

the paper. We advise the Program Committee to make special efforts to invite younger

members or members not otherwise on the program to fulfill these functions.

3e. That the Executive Director respond to requests by individuals or groups for worship or

meditation opportunities at the Annual Meeting by making available appropriate spaces and

time slots within the program schedule and by alerting members to these events.

3f. That the Board of Directors establish a mentoring program in which members, especially

new members, can be assigned to voluntary mentors in their fields who will provide ongoing

scholarly and pedagogical support and cultivate connections within the field.

3g. That the Society sponsor an annual “New Members” event for members of less than three

years duration, to be attended by them, the Board of Directors, and mentors of new members.

3h. That beginning with the Annual Meeting of 2002, the Program Committee invite narrative

and artistic approaches to ethical issues and develop new ways of integrating these into the

Annual Meeting.

3i. That the Board of Directors appoint a committee to establish writers’ groups. The aim

would be to encourage and mentor constructive new work among younger scholars (as

modeled by the University of Chicago Writers’ Group).

4. Recommendations Regarding Society Structures

4a. That the Society stimulate the establishment of additional regional sections of the SCE, as

has been accomplished by members in the Pacific Section.

4b. That the Annual Meeting incorporate the workshop format as a new structure with the

purpose of providing a forum for members to address pedagogical questions and skill-

building in multiple sessions at a given meeting. This workshop format would require advance

communication and pre-meeting reading of relevant materials.

4c. That the Editorial Board of the Annual be assigned the task of reexamining the purposes of

the Annual. Issues to be considered would include frequency of publication, eligibility of
submitted articles, name of the publication, and related issues. Consultation with past and present Editors and Editorial Board members is advised. A report to the Board is requested no later than the Annual Meeting, 2003.

4d. That the Society consider creating a list of consultants, consisting of interested members with expertise in particular areas, embodying the diversity of viewpoints representative of Society members. This would be a service of the society to non-academic groups debating issues, such as the media, denominational and religious agencies, and governmental and non-governmental organizations.

5. Recommendations Regarding the Expansion of Ethical Conversations within the Society

5a. That the Society of Christian Ethics establish working groups with four year mandates whose charge is to cultivate conversations and working relationships with ethicists focusing on the following areas: Hispanic Christian ethics, African and African-American Christian ethics, Jewish and Christian ethics, and Islamic and Christian ethics. These mandates might take the form of program sessions, committee membership, recommendations regarding meeting locations, recruitment efforts, and the like. The Board is urged to act on this recommendation as soon as possible and to establish at least one of these working groups by 2002. Interest groups might apply to be working groups in order to assume these responsibilities.

5b. Beyond recommendation 5a, in the future, other working groups might be designated to assume responsibilities for expanding conversations with other constituencies.

5c. That the Society forge formal as well as informal relationships with societies, associations, and individuals in other parts of the world (e.g., Europe, Asia, Africa, Latin America) who have similar interests in religions and ethics; that joint meetings be fostered and arranged; and that delegations of individuals who need economic assistance in order to participate in scholarly meetings be sponsored financially.

5d. That the Society encourage and foster conversations with ethicists working for religious bodies, research agencies, and governmental and non-governmental organizations and that ethicists in these settings be encouraged to become members of the SCE.

An appendix to this report of recommendations identifies areas of responsibility regarding the implementation of these recommendations by the SCE Board of Directors, the Executive Director, the Program Committee, and Society Members.

Appendix to the Report of Recommendations from the Committee for the Twenty-First Century Society of Christian Ethics

Implementation of the recommendations depends upon the initiatives of many sectors of the SCE: The Board of Directors, the Executive Director, the Program Committee, and Society Members. For the convenience of these constituencies, the Committee offers the following itemization of responsibilities.

Board of Directors
1d
2b
3a, 3b, 3f, 3l
4a, 4b, 4c, 4d
5a, 5b, 5c, 5d

Executive Director

1a, 1b, 1c
2a
3c, 3d, 3e, 3f, 3g, 3h
4b

Program Committee

3c, 3d, 3g, 3h
4b

Society Members

1a, 1b, 1c
3e, 3f
4a, 4b
5a, 5b, 5c, 5d
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Preface

1. Committee and Report

The SCE 2020 Committee on “The Future of Christian Ethics” was organized at the initiative of Stanley Hauerwas, then President of the Society, in 2011, and had its first meeting at the January 2012 Annual Meeting. The charge given to the Committee was large and open-ended:
The 2020 Committee will explore the current status of, and future prospects for, the field of "Christian ethics" as a field of scholarship and teaching in the academy. It will do so with an eye to reporting the findings of its inquiries, and communicating what recommendations may be derived therefrom, to the whole Society of Christian Ethics, in order better to inform and guide the actions of the Society, now and in years to come.

In short, we were to reflect upon the future of the field of Christian ethics, not the Society of Christian Ethics. As we are a largely American society, we largely attended to the United States (though we had some recourse also to Canadian institutions). We were to consider several kinds of questions, and to pursue answers to other questions as they presented themselves. In conversation, we were explicitly asked to consider the production of PhDs in the field—how they were trained, where they were trained, and how many were trained. Worries were expressed to us that the job market was drying up for future (and present-day) graduates of PhD programs. To do this, we had to assess the evidence for, and consider the likely consequences of, the possibly changing shape of the job market in Christian ethics—that is, the concern voiced by some that the location of “Christian ethics” as a teaching role in a department of religious studies was the product of a certain transitional phase as traditionally church-affiliated liberal arts colleges, mostly from the Protestant mainline denominations, moved into more secularized understandings of the educational process and, for reasons related both to budget and ideology, shifted positions that had been described as “Christian ethics” into “religious ethics” or “world religions” (or, in some ways more realistically, “Hotel management”). We were also asked to reflect on what participants in the field consider the right ways to teach Christian ethics, and in what content and form such teaching could go forward.

The challenges of so large and indeterminate a charge were daunting, and in our first meeting, and in the conversations that followed it for several months, we tried to come to a collective understanding of what we were actually called to do, and how we could organize ourselves to do it. A proximate solution to our conundrum was found when we decided we could distinguish several different questions, and thereby several different tasks, that needed pursuit. We then organized the committee into several distinct sub-committees that were tasked with particular questions.

The four committees we organized were as follows: (1) Training of PhDs: one was tasked with getting a provisional “map” of the various places that produce PhD students in Christian ethics and related areas. (2) Employment, Past and Future: Another was tasked with developing an understanding of the nature of the job market, going back as far as was practically possible to determine if any long-term underlying changes were discernable in the shape of the market. (3) The Topography of our Research Field: A third was tasked with generating a picture of what journals, book publishers, and other media were most likely to be the locations where the research of the field was brought before the field’s attention. Finally, (4) Membership survey about practices and pedagogy: a fourth was given the project of attempting to construct a survey that could be given to members of the SCE to determine the current profile of the membership, their understandings of the field, the nature of their teaching, and their expectations of (hopes and concerns about) where the field will go in coming years.

2. The Committee’s Findings

Our findings are provisional and partial, and this is not merely a rhetorical statement. They are provisional because, while the research that has produced them has been undertaken with tremendous effort and remarkable skill by members of the committee, we remain effectively amateurs at this kind of research activity, and hence can claim superiority to other members of the SCE only in the extent of our awareness of how limited our research accomplishments are. As to what we have accomplished, we are certain we have missed institutions producing PhDs, and we
have not gained data on some significant fraction of the job market. We welcome modifications and amplifications of our data by anyone who can provide it.

The findings are also partial because, even with our best efforts, we have been unable to complete all the tasks we hoped to accomplish. We had hoped to include in our report a survey that would offer a fairly comprehensive picture both of the interests and concerns of the membership of the SCE, as a somewhat (but only somewhat) representative sample of the field of “Christian ethics” as a whole. We had also hoped to include in our report a rich picture of what journals were most commonly used, and what we could learn, by learning what journals were frequently used, about the field’s most popular (or at least most frequently engaged) issues, debates, commitments and methodological approaches. Alas, neither of these projects have we managed to accomplish. And even beyond these, certainly other, further worthwhile research fronts merit engagement; we hope that our colleagues might name those research fronts, and advance our understanding along those axes, as well.

3. Production of PhDs

The subcommittee on the Programs that produce Ph.D.s (and analogous degrees, such as the Th.D.), ably led by David Gushee, were able to find what we considered a remarkably large number of institutions that produce scholars in Christian ethics or closely affiliated fields, such as “Moral Theology,” “Theological Ethics,” “Religious Ethics” or “Practical Theology.” They were able to find 57 distinct programs in North America, several in the same school, that could produce scholars of Christian ethics, and there are certainly more.

Beyond the sheer difficulty of finding the programs, a more fundamental difficulty that this sub-committee faced was conceptual: how do you determine what sort of training equips one to be a “Christian ethicist” or a scholar of “Christian ethics”? A generous and capacious definition would seem to be wise, given the range of topics—from contemporary to historical, applied to very theoretical—that can be the concern of Christian ethics.

It proved impossible to determine how many scholars with terminal degrees each of these programs produce in a given year, much less placement rates in academia for such programs. Part of the problem here lies in the sheer stochastic variation that afflicts graduate programs’ “output” of students—some years four or five graduate, some years no one does. But part of the problem was due also to the fact that institutions are quite chary of sharing this information. This is unfortunate because it would be valuable information to have. It is entirely unsurprising, however, for after all, each of these institutions have to make payroll, and anything that might hinder their capacity to do that will not be looked on fondly. While we do not suggest this is simply a case of “Moral field, immoral institutions” (for the old Niebuhrian reason that the field itself is far from being a moral agent), we note with some wry asperity that putatively theological institutions seem quite adept at the idiom of economic self-interest that is the argot of the late-capitalist Babylon in which we live, move, and from which we apparently try to have our being.

Beyond finding some way to uncover this data, other routes of inquiry suggest themselves. One could follow up this line of research by determining what sort of training each program requires. It would be interesting to discover what were the commonalities, and what were the distinctive dimensions, in the approaches that these various programs take to educating their students. Certainly some of this would be determined by history (the wisdom of the past and/or sheer inertia), and some would be the mark of recent discussions and debates at the various institutions. It might be quite interesting for the programs to learn from one another in this way.

4. Placement of PhDs

The subcommittee on the history and state of the job market, ably led by Jennifer Herdt, did an equally tremendous amount of research in archives, looking for information about employment opportunities. The main database was the American Academy of Religion’s Openings, the job listings for the AAR, between 2001 and 2012, complemented (for the period
1998-2000) by the Chronicle of Higher Education’s job listings. We gratefully acknowledge the generous assistance of Jack Fitzmier, Executive Director of the AAR, and his staff in helping us acquire the AAR data. That said, this was a tremendous amount of research by Prof. Herdt and her team, though of course nothing like what the National Security Agency could do in ten seconds.

The subcommittee is profoundly aware of the limited nature of their database, but they think it still warrants some very tentative and provisional suggestions. First, they believe it shows that “Moral Theology/Christian Ethics is well-established as a distinct sub-field.” There seems to be agreement, in academic circles at least, that the specialization of Christian ethics exists and warrants a place in the curriculum for study of Christianity or perhaps religion more broadly—though there is large diversity in understanding just what such a specialization includes, and where its center of gravity is. Furthermore, the dip in ethics positions advertised after the economic crisis of 2008 seems to be recovering, and there seems to be no measurable shift away from positions being entitled “Christian ethics” or “Moral Theology” and towards positions being entitled “religious ethics.” If that change is to come, it has not come yet.

Second, and interestingly, from 2001 forward, the data suggests that there were only two positions in Christian Ethics offered at Seminaries and Divinity Schools, and both of those were advertised before 2004; in contrast, they point out that in the single year of 1998-99, institutions of this sort advertised for eight jobs in ethics in the Chronicle of Higher Education. This perhaps gives some evidence of what some of us have heard whispered, namely, that free-standing seminaries and even Divinity schools are shifting their lines away from ethics and toward other specializations more directed towards successful church management.

Thirdly, it is clear that, in terms of positions offered and professionals already in academic positions who are engaged in the SCE, Roman Catholic institutions of higher education, especially Roman Catholic Colleges and Universities, have been and are becoming ever-more serious, some would say central, weight-bearing forces for the sustenance of Christian ethics (often under the more traditional category of “Moral Theology”) in North America. As the employment report below notes, nearly 50% of jobs on average are being offered by Catholic institutions, followed by secular and Protestant institutions, in the 10-30% range from year to year. Particularly as other forms of Christian institutions (Liberal Protestant / Mainline most especially) decline as representative members of the SCE, what changes might the increasing prominence of Roman Catholic church-affiliated institutions have on the shaping of Christian Ethics? This is a fascinating change that merits more reflection, and further study, in coming years.

We would like to have more confidence that we are in fact identifying all the possible employment opportunities out there, and that we are in fact tracking properly the changes and continuities occurring in the field today. Such stronger confidence might not change the conclusions, or modify the very slight or marginal trends we suggest here, but it would at least give us a firmer sense that these trends, such as they are, might merit reflection. As it is we feel that we can urge reflection on these more as hypotheses than as confirmed realities.

5. Large Changes Meriting Further Reflection

We would be remiss if we did not note that there are two large changes that seem to have taken place in recent decades that merit reflection. The first is the rise of Roman Catholic thinkers as a presence in the field. Unlike in the early 1970s, today “Christian Ethics” is carried on in a rich trans-denominational conversation, not just among Protestant denominations, but also with Roman Catholic thinkers. Positions in our field seem—and we cannot go farther, on the basis of this evidence, than seem—also increasingly to be located within Roman Catholic institutions. Perhaps this is a rise to parity on the part of Roman Catholic thinkers; perhaps it bespeaks also a decline in Mainline Protestant Christian Ethics. What does this mean—if anything—for the future shape of Christian Ethics?

Secondly, some of us suspect that there is some evidence to suggest that (and the tentativeness of that claim is purposive) over the past few decades, the field of Christian Ethics has
become too firmly a “field”—professionally distinct, and disciplinarily reflexive, in a way too much like other academic fields. (Again, in this draft report we do not present much direct evidence for this suspicion, but it is congruent with evidence, slightly more than anecdotal, of the changing shape of membership in the SCE and the developing character of the profession’s self-understanding as represented in its main journal, the *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*. (The evidence is overlapping with another journal well-known to members of the Society, namely the *Journal of Religious Ethics*.) Given that “Christian Ethics” has, at least on many received understandings, a vocational responsibility to the Christian churches, such an “academic captivity” may mean that something has been lost, alongside the many gains. How ought we to understand Christian Ethics’ multiple modes of engagement with ecclesial structures? Should there be more attention directed, from both sides, to this relationship? (It is an interesting fact that members of several churches’ central bureaucratic structures were originally involved in the founding of the SCE, and regularly attended meetings in the 1970s; one would be surprised to find them, in any significant way, part of the SCE now.) Again, we raise this merely as a point of provocation.

**Conclusion to Preface**

Though the work below is expressly the work of the members of the subcommittees named, it would not be fair to say that the other members of the Committee did not participate. Each of the members have done a tremendous amount of work, both during the SCE Annual Meetings of the past two years and outside of those meetings, and all deserve the thanks of the Society as a whole. We are especially grateful to the three Presidents who supported this program not least with their membership on the Committee, namely Stanley Hauerwas, Miguel De La Torre, and Allen Verhey.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Mathewes, Chair
Report of the Doctoral Programs Subcommittee
Members: David Gushee, chair; Miguel De La Torre, Grace Kao, Peter Paris

Introductory Comments
The task of our subcommittee as we understood it was to examine doctoral degrees in Christian ethics as a sort of barometer for the field in general. We were to report back to the SCE 2020 Committee all relevant programs, listing them according to degree title, degree expectations, and faculty with listed specializations.

To gain this information we used general search engine queries, a starting list provided by University of Virginia researcher Mark Storslee, the Society of Christian Ethics’ own list of programs and members, a list from the Fund for Theological Education, the Association for Theological Schools list of member schools granting doctoral degrees, and the American Academy of Religion’s database of doctoral programs in religion. We also examined programs in Practical Theology to see if these now (sometimes) amount to Christian ethics degree programs. David Gushee would like to express his gratitude to all members of the subcommittee for their work, as well as his own student Isaac B. Sharp for extensive research and analysis.

Examining the sprawling array of programs that could conceivably be classified as doctoral programs in (Christian) ethics, we made the decision to limit the results to North American institutions that make explicit the ability for doctoral students to focus in Christian ethics either as a primary field (i.e. a PhD/ThD in Christian Ethics or Moral Theology) or as a subfield (i.e. a PhD/ThD in Religion or Theology with the primary field of study as Christian or Religious Ethics). We chose not to count programs in Philosophy with a subfield in Moral Philosophy or Moral Theory. We did not count programs in bioethics unless they were connected to broader programs in Christian Ethics. We also resisted the temptation to include every possible related program such as Religion and Society in, say, a public policy or political science doctoral degree. But we assume considerable overlap in research interests if not methodology between the work of Christian Ethics and that of political philosophers and political scientists working in such issue areas.

The results show a few interesting trends. It seems apparent that there is a profound lack of clarity as to what the field of Christian Ethics actually is and in some cases whether it is a legitimate field or line of inquiry within the broader heading of theological or religious studies:

a) Those programs that offer work in Christian Ethics often treat it as a subfield of some other field, and which other field varies considerably.

b) There are a number of programs granting PhDs in religion, religious studies, and theology that have no identifiable possibility of a focus in Christian or religious ethics.

c) The question of what might count as a focus in ethics, furthermore, obscures the potential clarity of a definitive “field.”

There are several institutions, for example, offering Religion and Society or Religion and Culture emphases that may be ethics programs in disguise. But this is often hard to determine when there are also schools—Princeton Theological Seminary, for instance—that separate Christian Ethics and Religion and Society into two separate fields in two separate programs.

It seems fair to contrast the relative opacity of our field with, for example, the seemingly hard lines defining the field of Biblical Studies (or Textual or Scriptural Studies). Biblical studies does not, at least not very often, get confused with the related fields of homiletics or theology. Many schools offer programs in biblical/scriptural studies, and students may focus in Hebrew Bible, the New Testament, Qur’anic studies, and so on. Theological schools and university religion programs alike nearly universally offer such textual study as a legitimate field. The matter is not nearly so clear with ethics.
Compound these complications with the intra-field differences in approach ranging from programs primarily associated with theological ethics or exclusively focusing on social ethics, or even the difference between descriptive and prescriptive approaches, or Christian vs. comparative approaches, and the inherent confusion of the field becomes even more apparent.

It is also possible that developments in the field now called Practical Theology will also begin to impinge on or overlap with the field of Christian Ethics. In a separate examination of Practical Theology programs and their impact on or relation to Ethics programs, Dr. Peter Paris lists seven schools that offer Practical Theology as a focus and then says:

My conclusion is that I can find no negative impact of practical theology programs on the Ph.D. programs in Theological Ethics, Ethics and Society, Religion and Society, or Church and Society which I consider to be the more traditional approaches to the teaching of ethics. As a matter of fact, programs in practical theology seem not to engage ethical studies very much at all. Rather, as stated above, their central focus is on the traditional arts or practices of ministry.

From the perspective of the interests of the discipline of Christian Ethics, this is a hopeful conclusion. The matter will bear watching in years to come.

**Listing of Programs**

I. We begin with three institutions offering degree programs that involve highly recognizable figures in the Society of Christian Ethics that do not easily classify as Christian Ethics programs according to any of our search criteria. These demonstrate the difficulty of clarifying what “Christian Ethics doctoral programs” might actually be said to exist, as these programs surely graduate “Christian ethicists,” and yet one could not know it from the official listing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>DEGREE/FIELD</th>
<th>LISTED FACULTY</th>
<th>WEBSITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian Theological Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliff School of Theology</td>
<td>PhD: Religious and Theological Studies</td>
<td>Miguel A. De La Torre, Edward Phillip Antonio</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iliff.edu/">http://www.iliff.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion and Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>DEGREE/FIELD</td>
<td>LISTED FACULTY</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria University</td>
<td>PhD: Theology</td>
<td>Steven Long</td>
<td><a href="http://www.avemaria.edu/">http://www.avemaria.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral Theology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>PhD: Religion</td>
<td>Barry Harvey, Paul Martens, Jonathan Tran</td>
<td><a href="http://www.baylor.edu/">http://www.baylor.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theology, Subfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>PhD: Theology</td>
<td>Lisa Sowle Cahill, Donald J. Dietrich, Kenneth Himes, Michael Himes, David</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bc.edu/content/bc/schools/cas/theology.html">http://www.bc.edu/content/bc/schools/cas/theology.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration:</td>
<td>Hollenbach, James Keenan, John J. Paris, Stephen J. Pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theological Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion and Society, subfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University School of</td>
<td>ThD: Philosophy, Theology and Ethics</td>
<td>John Hart, Michael Grodin, Wesley J. Wildman</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bu.edu/religion/">http://www.bu.edu/religion/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social and Theological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Now we continue with the listing of all programs that we think more or less clearly qualify as “degree programs in Christian ethics.” Obviously, faculty are often on the move, and programs are often revised, but these are accurate as of July 2013, to the best of our knowledge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field of Study/Concentration:</th>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Theological Seminary</td>
<td>PhD: Moral Theology</td>
<td>Calvin P. Van Reken</td>
<td><a href="http://calvinseminary.edu/">http://calvinseminary.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Catholic University of America</td>
<td>PhD: Moral Theology and Ethics</td>
<td>Brian Johnstone, William Barbieri, Joseph Capizzi, John Grabowski, William Mattison, David Lantigua</td>
<td><a href="http://trs.cua.edu/">http://trs.cua.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Theological Seminary</td>
<td>PhD: Theology, Ethics and the Human Sciences</td>
<td>JoAnne Marie Terrell</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ctschicago.edu/">http://www.ctschicago.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Graduate University</td>
<td>PhD: Philosophy of Religion and Theology</td>
<td>Richard Amesbury, Jerry A. Irish</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cgu.edu/">http://www.cgu.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia University</td>
<td>PhD: Religion</td>
<td>Donald Boisvert, Marc Lalonde, Michael Oppenheim, Norman Ravvin</td>
<td><a href="http://religion.concordia.ca/graduate/programs/">http://religion.concordia.ca/graduate/programs/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew University</td>
<td>PhD: Religion</td>
<td>Traci West, Laurel Kearns, Kate Ott</td>
<td><a href="http://www.drew.edu/">http://www.drew.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duquesne University</td>
<td>PhD: Theology</td>
<td>James Bailey, Elizabeth Agnew Cochran, Aaron L. Mackler, Anna Floerke Scheid, Daniel P. Scheid</td>
<td><a href="http://www.duq.edu/">http://www.duq.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration</td>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>PhD: Religion</td>
<td>Ethics and Society</td>
<td>Elizabeth Bounds, Abdullahi Ahmed An-Na'im, Michael Berger, Timothy P. Jackson, Ellen Ott Marshall, Don Seeman, Steven M. Tipton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>PhD: Theology</td>
<td>Systematic Theology (Subfield Ethics)</td>
<td>Barbara Andolsen, Charles Camosy, Christine Firer Hinze, Elizabeth A. Johnson, Maureen H. O’Connell, Christiana Peppard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Evangelical Theological Seminary</td>
<td>PhD: Theology and Ethics</td>
<td>Brent Waters</td>
<td><a href="http://www.garrett.edu/">http://www.garrett.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Theological Seminary</td>
<td>ThD: Theology</td>
<td>Anglican Theology, Subfield Moral Theology</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>PhD: Religion</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Preston Williams, Anne Monius, Charles Hallisey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University Bloomington</td>
<td>PhD: Religious Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winnifred Sullivan, Richard Miller, Lisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration</td>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University Chicago</td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration: Ethics, Philosophy and Politics in the Study of Religion</td>
<td>Sideris, Aaron Stalnaker</td>
<td><a href="http://www.luc.edu">http://www.luc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration: Integrative Studies in Ethics and Theology</td>
<td>William C. French, Hille Haker, Tisha Rajendra, Susan Ross, Michael Schuck, Sandra Sullivan-Dunbar, Aana Marie Vigen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago</td>
<td>PhD: Theological studies</td>
<td>Linda Thomas, Richard J. Perry Jr., Lea F. Schweitz, Mark Swanson, Vitor Westhelle</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lstc.edu/">http://www.lstc.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia</td>
<td>PhD: Constructive Theology/Ethics</td>
<td>Katie Day, Paul Rajashekar, Nelson Rivera</td>
<td><a href="http://ltsp.edu/">http://ltsp.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luther Seminary</td>
<td>PhD: Systematic Theology</td>
<td>Charles Amjad-Ali, Guillermo C. Hansen, Amy E. Marga, Alan G. Padgett, Gary M. Simpson</td>
<td><a href="http://www.luthersem.edu/">http://www.luthersem.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>PhD: Theology</td>
<td>Michael K. Duffy, Daniel C. Maguire, Bryan N. Massingale, Phillip J. Rossi</td>
<td><a href="http://www.marquette.edu/">http://www.marquette.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster University</td>
<td>PhD: Religious Studies</td>
<td>Zdravko Planinc, Dana Hollander, Travis Kroeker</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mcmaster.ca/">http://www.mcmaster.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>PhD:</td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>Religion, Ethics and Public Life</td>
<td>George Bond, Christine Helmer, Robert Orsi, Sarah Taylor, Cristina Traina, Barry Wimpfheimer, Laurie Zoloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist Theological</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Theological Studies, Christian Ethics concentration</td>
<td>Miroslav Kiš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary of Andrews University</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>Worldview and Culture, subfield Christian Ethics</td>
<td>Kenneth T. Magnuson, Russell D. Moore (just left to be head of SBC ethics commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Theological Studies</td>
<td>Christian Ethics</td>
<td>Bruce Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Baptist Theological</td>
<td>Theological Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William E. Goff, Evan Lenow, Craig V. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Baptist Theological</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Methodist University</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>PhD Program</td>
<td>Field of Study/Concentration</td>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>Modern Religious Thought, Ethics, and Philosophy</td>
<td>Hester Gelber, Kathryn Gin Lum, Barbara Pitkin, Thomas Sheehan, Brent Sockness, Lee Yearley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul University</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Kenneth Melchin, Carolyn Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>Ethics (Practical Theology subfield Church and Society)</td>
<td>Gary Dorrien, Christopher Morse, Samuel Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Université Laval</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Theological Ethics, Bioethics</td>
<td>Guy Jobin, Bernard Keating, Francois Nault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>Values, Ethics and Human Rights</td>
<td>Catherine Chin, Mark Elmore, Milmon Harrison, John Smolenski, Diane L. Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago Divinity School</td>
<td>Constructive Studies of Religion</td>
<td>Religious Ethics</td>
<td>William Schweiker, Daniel P. Sulmasy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| University of Notre Dame | PhD: Theology | David A. Clairmont, M. Cathleen Kaveny, Gerald McKenny, Paulinus I. Odozor, Margaret Pfeil, Jean Porter, Maura A. Ryan, Todd D. Whitmore | http://theology.nd.edu/ |

| University of Quebec at Montreal | PhD: Religious Studies | N/A | http://www.etudier.uqam.ca/ |


| University of Virginia | PhD: Religion | James Childress, Willis Jenkins, Charles Mathewes, Margaret E. Mohrmann | http://religiousstudies.virginia.edu |

Note: Currently the SCE Website lists schools purportedly allowing a focus in Christian Ethics (or related fields). We list below with a check those schools that according to our research actually allow a focus in Christian Ethics, at the doctoral level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field of Study/Concentration: Ethics and Society</th>
<th>Barnes, Larry Churchill, Stacey-Floyd Thomas, Graham Reside, Melissa Snarr</th>
<th>vanderbilt.edu/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>PhD: Religion</td>
<td>Jennifer Herdt, David H. Smith, Margaret Farley, Thomas Ogletree</td>
<td><a href="http://religiousstudies.yale.edu/">http://religiousstudies.yale.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asbury Theological Seminary: No
Ashland Theological Seminary: No
Baylor University: √
Boston College: √
Boston University: √
Brite Divinity School: No
Brown University: √
Calvin Theological Seminary: √
Catholic University of America: √
Chicago Theological Seminary: √
Claremont School of Theology: √ through Claremont Lincoln University
Columbia Theological Seminary: No
Concordia Seminary: No
Dallas Theological Seminary: No
Darden School of Business, UVA: No
Duke University Divinity School: √
Duquesne University: √
Emmanuel College: No
Emory University: √
Florida State University: √
Fordham University: √
Fuller Theological Seminary: √
Garrett Evangelical Theological Seminary: √
General Theological Seminary: √
Georgetown University: No
Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary: No
Graduate Theological Union: √
Harvard Divinity School: √
Iliff School of Theology/University of Denver: √
Indiana University: √
Interdenominational Theological Center: No
Jesuit School of Theology: No
Loyola University Chicago: ✓
Luther Seminary: ✓
Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago: ✓
Lutheran Theological Seminary Philadelphia: ✓
Marquette University: ✓
McMaster University: ✓
New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary: No
Northwestern University: ✓
Penn State: No
Princeton Theological Seminary: ✓
Princeton University: ✓
Reformed Theological Seminary: No
Regis College, University of Toronto: No
Rice University: No
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary: ✓
Southern Methodist University: ✓
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary: ✓
St. Louis University: No
St. Paul University: ✓
Stanford University: ✓
Syracuse University: ✓
Temple University: No
Trinity College Faculty of Divinity: No
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School: No
UC Santa Barbara: No
UC Davis: ✓
UCLA: No
Union Theological Seminary: ✓
Union Presbyterian Richmond: No
University of Chicago Divinity School: ✓
University of Dayton: No*
University of Iowa: ✓
UNC Chapel Hill: No
University of Notre Dame: ✓
University of Oregon: No
University of Ottawa: No
University of Pittsburgh: No
USC: No
University of St. Michael’s College: No
University of Toronto: ✓
University of Virginia: ✓
University of Waterloo: No
University of Zurich: Out of range
Vanderbilt University: ✓
Villanova University: No
Westminster Theological Seminary: No
Weston Jesuit School of Theology (Boston College): No
Wycliffe College: No
Yale University: ✓
II. Report of the Jobs Subcommittee
Members: Jennifer Herdt, chair; Victor Carmona, Perry Hamalis, Rebecca Peters
Research Associate: Andrew Forsyth

Prefatory Remark: Methodology and Limitations of the Study
This study is based on data collected from the Chronicle of Higher Education for the years 1998-1999 and 1999-2000, and from the AAR Annual Meeting Jobs Listings for the years 2001-2012. Unfortunately, it was not possible to obtain the jobs listings from the AAR Openings publication for the period being studied; and it seems that those records have simply not been kept, even by AAR itself. It was also not possible to obtain the AAR Annual Meeting Jobs Listings for the years prior to 2001. While some libraries maintain print copies of AAR publications, these do not include Openings. There are resulting limitations of this study. This is only a subset of the full number of job openings in the discipline in any given year. Further, the data from the Chronicle of Higher Education is not directly comparable with that from Openings; the Chronicle lists a broader variety of positions in ethics, based in a broader array of disciplines, and listed by a more diverse collection of institutions. Given more funding, it would be possible to study the position listings in the Chronicle of Higher Education for the entire period. It would also be desirable to find ways of learning about positions offered by institutions that might avoid both of these publishing venues. Our committee made some efforts to look for job listings in journals or periodicals that are directed toward audiences that might avoid these venues, but we were not able to find a reliable way to measure what the Chronicle/AAR Annual Meeting Jobs Listing listings leave out.

What can this data tell us about the current state of the field?
The annual number of job listings in Ethics over the past decade has fallen and risen in tandem with the overall number of jobs advertised in AAR Annual Meeting Jobs Listing (Figures 1 and 2). Table 1 and Figure 1 include all positions that were primarily ethics jobs, even if not described that way. Table 2 and Figure 2 show the positions clearly designated as positions in ethics; hence, this is a slightly smaller number than in Table/Figure 1. Perhaps some of the best news of this study is that while there was a sharp downturn in the number of ethics jobs in 2008-2010, by 2011 jobs were rebounding, and in 2012 had nearly reached figures from 2007. There is no indication that the number of jobs in ethics has lost ground as a proportion of the total number of jobs being advertised in the Annual Meeting Jobs Listing. This suggests that jobs in ethics are rebounding with the general economy, and that losses in recent years do not signal a general shift away from support for positions in the field.

How are positions in ethics being described?
Out of 132 positions advertised in the AAR Annual Meeting Jobs Listing between 2001 and 2012, 34 were described as “Ethics,” 26 as “Moral Theology,” 24 as “Christian Ethics,” 11 as “Religious Ethics,” and 8 as “Theological Ethics” (Tables 1 and 2). This suggests that “generalists” are being sought more than specialists. The preference for generalists also seems corroborated by the declining numbers on “pairing” ethics with other fields, especially from 2007-2012 (Figure 3). The use of the “Ethics” descriptor may reflect a desire for a more ecumenical term than either “Moral Theology” or “Christian Ethics.” However, “Theological Ethics” might also be regarded as bridging this divide, and there is no indication of any trends over this period of time toward a greater use of that descriptor. “Ethics” may also be a term preferred by departments of religious studies, as an alternative to “Religious Ethics.” There is also no discernable trend toward a preference for the “Religious Ethics” descriptor.

With what other fields are jobs in ethics being paired?
Most often, positions are described simply as jobs in “Moral Theology,” “Christian Ethics,” “Religious Ethics,” or some other “ethics” descriptor, without being linked with other subfields. Over the period we studied, there are no trends toward more frequent pairing of ethics with other subfields (Figure 3). This suggests that Moral Theology/Christian Ethics is well-established as a distinct sub-field (though again, with large disputes about what exactly it consists in), and that this has not eroded despite the recent recession. Academic departments and seminaries (including the hiring decision-makers that are involved across multiple institutional layers) appear to have retained a fairly clear sense that the discipline requires a distinct set of competencies that may not be easily taught or practiced by academics trained in other disciplines (e.g., systematic theology, Biblical studies, etc.) When ethics jobs are paired with other subfields, the most common accompaniments are theology, politics/public affairs, and philosophy (Table 4).

**At what rank are jobs being offered?**

By far the majority of jobs being advertised in the AAR Annual Meeting Jobs Listing are tenure-track positions, with small numbers of non-tenure track and tenured positions in the mix (Table 5, Figures 4, 5). There is no clear trend of growth in non tenure-track positions over the period being studied. However, this impression must be taken with a grain of salt, as it is likely the case that most temporary and part-time jobs are simply not advertised in the AAR Annual Meeting Jobs Listing.

**In what departments or schools are jobs offered?**

Ethics jobs advertised in the AAR Annual Meeting Jobs Listing are generally in Departments of Theology (26), Departments of Religious Studies (26), Ethics Centers (5), Seminaries/Schools of Divinity (2), or Departments of Philosophy and Religion (12) (Table 6, Figure 6). The most striking piece of data here is that no ethics positions were offered at Seminaries or Divinity Schools from 2004 onward, with only two positions offered between 2001 and 2012. Without more of a longitudinal perspective and a better data set, of course, it is difficult to say with any confidence that this represents a significant decline. It may be the case that our information is hindered by our resources. Anecdotal evidence indicates that there were in fact a significant number of positions advertised at Seminaries and Divinity Schools during the period. The figures captured here are certainly a dramatic contrast with 1998-99, when 8 ethics jobs were advertised in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* by seminaries or divinity schools. It is difficult to compare this figure directly with the figures for advertisements in the AAR Annual Meeting Jobs Listing, since it is possible that there are schools that choose never to advertise in the AAR Annual Meeting Jobs Listing, but who do advertise in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. We can see in looking at the data on the kinds of institutions listing jobs that colleges that offer only Associates degrees appear to advertise in the *Chronicle* but not in the AAR Annual Meeting Jobs Listing.

**What kinds of institutions offer jobs in Moral Theology/Christian Ethics/ Religious Ethics?**

Jobs are advertised primarily by colleges and universities, with significantly fewer jobs being advertised by freestanding seminaries or divinity schools, although this may reflect the source of our data rather than the realities of the job market (Table 7, Figure 7). There are no clear shifts over time in the institutional location of ethics jobs. While there are fluctuations over time, our data suggests that nearly 50% of jobs on average are being offered by Catholic institutions, followed by secular and Protestant institutions, in the 10-30% range from year to year (Table 8, Figures 8-9).

**Conclusion**

Given that this report focuses on job advertisements over the past decade, it can be of only limited usefulness for forecasting the future. It does suggest an encouraging rebound in ethics jobs as the economy has slowly recovered from the recession. It also suggests a stable (if bi-focal)
identity as Moral Theology/Christian Ethics, and a three-legged stool in terms of institutional location, with Catholic institutions playing a particularly important role. Finally, it would be strongly advisable for the Society to consider putting in place some mechanism whereby we can keep track of positions in our field in coming years, perhaps in collaboration with the American Academy of Religion, which has both an interest in and some expertise at gathering employment data across the field in religious studies. Having a reliable database on these matters, to which the Society had access, would be of significant help for future inquiries such as ours.

Table 1: AAR JOBS LISTINGS
SUBSTANTIVE ETHICS JOBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL LISTINGS</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Listings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: AAR JOBS LISTINGS
JOBS LISTED UNDER “ETHICS,” “CHRISTIAN ETHICS,” AND/OR “RELIGIOUS ETHICS”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL LISTINGS</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Listings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: HOW ARE ETHICS JOBS DESCRIBED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR (a)</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Human Values</th>
<th>Christian Ethics</th>
<th>Theological Ethics</th>
<th>Catholic Social Teaching</th>
<th>Catholic Studies</th>
<th>Catholic Moral Theology</th>
<th>Applied Ethics</th>
<th>Catholic Religious Ethics</th>
<th>Catholic Moral Tradition</th>
<th>Comparative Religious Ethics</th>
<th>Christian Social Ethics</th>
<th>Social Ethics</th>
<th>Environmental Ethics</th>
<th>Jewish Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*1) 1998-99 and 1999-00 are from the Chronicle, and should not be directly compared to 2001 onward (from AAR Annual Meeting).

(*2) The context of publication and often the content of the fuller advert, and/or institutional location of the appointment, may make it clear than "Religion" is tied to Ethics. E.g. It is an ethics post in a religion department not a philosophy department being advertised.
Table 4: WITH WHAT OTHER FIELDS IS ETHICS PAIRED?
Other fields listed with ethics in the job title or as co-primary in the job description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR (*1)</th>
<th>Not Paired</th>
<th>Human Values</th>
<th>Women's Studies/Women and Religion</th>
<th>Theology</th>
<th>Bible</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Psychiatry</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Computing</th>
<th>Religion and Society</th>
<th>Politics/Public Life</th>
<th>Peace Studies</th>
<th>Faith and Life</th>
<th>International Affairs</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Jewish Studies</th>
<th>Ecology</th>
<th>Church History</th>
<th>Religion/Region</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*1) 1998-99 and 1999-00 are from the Chronicle, and should not be directly compared to 2001 onward (from AAR Annual Meeting).

Table 5: WHAT RANK?
Where the job rank is listed as "open" or includes multiple ranks, the more or most senior is recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR (*1)</th>
<th>Non-tenure track</th>
<th>Tenure-track</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*1) 1998-99 and 1999-00 are from the Chronicle, and should not be directly compared to 2001 onward (from AAR Annual Meeting).
Table 6: WHAT DEPARTMENT OR UNIT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR (**)</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Seminary</th>
<th>School of Divinity</th>
<th>School of Education or Program</th>
<th>Ethics Center or Program</th>
<th>Not Specified</th>
<th>Philosophy and Religion</th>
<th>Public Policy</th>
<th>Theology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*1) 1998-99 and 1999-00 are from the Chronicle, and should not be directly compared to 2001 onward (from AAR Annual Meeting).

Table 7: TYPE OF INSTITUTION?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR (**)</th>
<th>Doctorate-granting Universities</th>
<th>Doctorate Institutions</th>
<th>Seminary</th>
<th>School of Divinity</th>
<th>School of School of Education or Program</th>
<th>Ethics Center or Program</th>
<th>Not Specified</th>
<th>Special Focus Institution</th>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Masters Colleges and Universities</th>
<th>Baccalaureate Colleges</th>
<th>Associates Colleges</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*1) 1998-99 and 1999-00 are from the Chronicle, and should not be directly compared to 2001 onward (from AAR Annual Meeting).
Table 8: CURRENT AFFILIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR (*1)</th>
<th>Secular</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Other Christian</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Other Religious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*1) 1998-99 and 1999-00 are from the Chronicle, and should not be directly compared to 2001 onward (from AAR Annual Meeting).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-tenure track</th>
<th>Tenure-track</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4*

**AAR Annual Meeting Listings Job Rank**

![Graph showing job rank percentages for different years](image)

*Figure 5*
Figure 6

Department or Program Location of Job

Figure 7

Institution of Job Listings
Report of the Survey Subcommittee
Members: Elizabeth Hinson-Hasty, chair; Angela Sims, Willis Jenkins

Following the 2013 SCE Annual Meeting the survey subcommittee gathered questions to be included in a survey to be sent out to all members of SCE, considered the primary goals of the survey, and investigated the cost of hiring someone to design the survey and analyze the findings.

Primary goals of the Survey
The survey subcommittee determined that the survey should have two primary goals: first, to deal with internal questions related to where ethicists are publishing; and, second, to poll external constituencies and consider how ethics is viewed by other disciplines. In light of these two goals, the survey subcommittee discussed the importance of finding someone with expertise in constructing a survey instrument that would be able to accomplish them.

These goals were determined by the subcommittee’s assessment of two basic questions motivating the work of the 2020 Committee as a whole. Those questions are, first, what is the future state of the field of Christian Ethics, given that the originary institutional context out of which the field emerged—the dynamic presence of Christian ethics in Protestant seminaries, and the vibrant presence of Protestant liberal arts colleges in the 1960s and 70s—seems to be changing? Second, has the field become paradoxically too professional, in an academic disciplinary sense, with a concomitant loss of connections to lived theology as it is practiced in local churches, and also a loss of connection to larger extra-academic ecclesial structures, such as the churches themselves? These questions seem important to get at, though how exactly we were to do that, remained obscure.

The subcommittee discovered that the task of constructing and employing a survey is a tremendously technically complicated endeavor, and one not immediately amenable to amateur undertakings. A truly useful survey would require the use of experts, and experts do not come cheap. For a membership survey, the cost of such a project was estimated by several experts to run somewhere around $5000. When this was proposed to the SCE Executive Board, there was reluctance to invest that much money. The Board proposed that since the SCE has a contract with “Survey Monkey”, we could design and run a survey on our own. But the difficulty is not essentially in finding a useful website or survey instrument employed to gather the information; the difficulty is in the design of the questions, and the analysis of the subsequent results. These are the “expert moments,” where we need expert assistance. We simply lack the in-house expertise to do this.

Therefore the subcommittee concluded that the best thing they could do, at this point, is gather questions as widely as possible and pool them, in hopes of finding some way to support such a survey at some point in the future.

Questions Gathered for the Survey
We have organized the questions around two foci, teaching and research.

Questions related to Teaching:
How many people are there in your department or program?
How is that department or program identified?
What is your course load?
What is a normal course load for a member of your department/program?
What courses do you teach?
What percentage of your courses are ethics courses?
Are there other faculty members in your department or program who teach ethics?
Has your department/program hired an ethicist (including yourself) over the past 5 years?
Do you anticipate making a hire in ethics over the next 5 years?
When an ethicist/person who teaches ethics in your department next retires or leaves, how likely do you think it is that they will be replaced by another ethicist/person who teaches ethics?

What type of institutional support is provided for people teaching ethics who are not serving in tenure track positions?

Is it your perception that institutions as a whole are moving away from tenured positions?

What impact do you think that will have on the field?

Questions Regarding Research and Publication:
- What publications do you routinely read for your professional work in Christian Ethics?
- To what publications do you submit articles for publication?
- What online resources in Christian Ethics do you use?
- Do you feel that there are areas of ethics that are neglected in the major journals of Christian Ethics?
- Is publishing in peer reviewed journals a requirement of your position?
- How difficult have you found it to meet the publishing requirement?
- Is publishing for pastoral or more general audiences given sufficient weight in academic performance reviews?
- If an undergraduate says that she wants to pursue a PhD in Christian ethics in order to become a professor, all other things being equal, would you encourage her?

Estimated Cost of Survey
- After some preliminary investigation the cost of hiring someone with expertise in designing surveys and analyzing the data gathered is estimated at around $5,000.

Conclusion
- A survey of this sort could be quite valuable to do. It could cultivate a deeper self-awareness about the character of our work as teachers and as scholars, and provoke some conversation in SCE about the future of our field. Furthermore, it would help us gather more information about what more there is to learn about the current state and future prospects of our field. Finally, we also hope to get some interesting researchable questions out of our collective ruminations—that is, questions that we can try to answer, with some degree of understanding, in a properly shaped survey.

Conclusion to Full Report
- We hope this provisional report sparks further inquiry rather than simple data supplementation. We hope it provokes the membership of the SCE to discussion, and gives rise to large, fundamental questions about the shape and trajectory of the field, what we are doing as representatives of the field, and how our scholarship and teaching should respond to our fresh understanding of the shape and trajectory of the field.

Despite our research effort’s undoubted inadequacies and limitations, we mean for it to help us identify and bring into focus some very fundamental questions. For behind all our several sub-reports looms a straightforward set of questions: How do we understand the field in which we teach and do research? How do our institutions understand it? What is the likely future of the relation between our understanding of the field in which we work and institutional support for it? These are the questions that the 2020 Committee was intended to raise for the SCE’s consideration, and we hope to have helped advance that consideration here.

It is clear, at least to us, that there is further research still to do on matters contained in this report. Nonetheless, we do feel that it is sufficient to offer to the Society, and hopefully to
I want to begin with an acknowledgement of the trepidation I feel about commenting on the future of the field of Christian ethics, especially in response to this very rich document prepared by a rather intimidating committee. It is clear that many hours of thankless work have gone into this report and all I ask is that the following comments be considered as an expression of gratitude for all that has gone into it.

In the limited time I have this morning, I would like to make one observation about the picture of the field that emerges in the report along with three further observations about elements of the field that are only tangentially (or perhaps emotively) present in the report.

A. An Observation Concerning Relative Stability

The first observation that I would like to comment on briefly is simply that I was surprised to see the relative stability of the field over the past twelve years in terms of the percentage of positions advertised at AAR and the predominance of hires in the “tenure-track” category—both good news in this economy. Of course, this stability is relative to the larger fluctuations in the academic world, but it appears that our field is no more “expendable” than other religion-related fields that advertise through AAR…and I think that we ought to consider that at least moderately good news…
Further, one other mark of stability: it appears that Catholic institutions have been hiring Christian ethicists more than any other type of institution for over a decade (with only 1 exception). I assume that this does not necessarily mean that Catholic institutions are hiring only Catholics and that Catholics are not getting jobs in other institutions…but I think the report rightly notes that any longevity to this trend will have a significant effect on the field (and I will return to this observation).

B. Three Further Comments beyond the Report

The Report of the 2020 Committee captures some of the important quantifiable elements of the field (especially for those of us who appreciate making a living doing this work). But, laced within and perhaps behind the report, there seems to be an amorphous anxiety about our field…yes, there is the obvious anxiety about employment statistics…and we could add other things to that list that we should be anxious about, for example: (a) the gender and racial imbalances in the field; (b) the practice of accepting way more PhD students in the field than we can ever hope to find jobs; (c) the evolving relationship between non-tenured and tenured/tenure-track members of the field; and (d) the national myopia that creeps into the field. These (and others) are all appropriate sources of anxiety that deserve considerable further attention…but these are not what I want to concentrate on this morning.

Rather, I want to attend to what I believe to be another kind of anxiety also haunts the report, a kind of anxiety about what exactly we are talking about when we are talking about Christian ethics. Therefore, the remainder of my comments are directed toward this latent anxiety because I am convinced that how we—collectively—address this anxiety will determine the future of the field. To that end, please bear with me as I indicate three further unstated issues that are shaping and will continue to shape the field of Christian ethics.

1. The Expansive Size of the Field. In the 1950’s, the SCE began as a dozen or so Protestant seminary professors but, for at least the past decade, there have been over 1000 members…and many of us neither teach at a seminary nor are Protestant. The fact is that although many of us recognize the names and faces (and perhaps even know) some of the more “famous” or “popular” members of the society—and I’m not sure how else to say that—the vast majority of the other members of the society are unknown to the vast majority of us. The effect, as one might expect, is that there is increasingly less of a common “center” around which we all naturally gather, whether that center is an institution, an issue, an interest, or an individual. [It may be worth noting that how we then work together within this context requires patience, humility, and generosity (and we have been blessed by a large cloud of witnesses in this respect)—without these, it appears to me that the stability of the field itself is up for grabs.] The observation concerning the size of the field naturally leads to a related observation concerning the increased specialization and diversity within the field (both in terms of teaching and research).

2. The Increased Specialization and Diversity within the Field. Until very recently, it was possible to conclude that the majority of the papers presented at the SCE Annual Meeting dealt with “foundational issues—that is, consideration of the biblical, historical, philosophical, theological, and social-scientific grounding of the discipline.”5 And, I suspect how different institutions valued these various foundations lies at the root to the programmatic distinctions between “Christian Ethics” and “Moral Theology” PhD programs on one side, and the various

---

other nomenclature, such as “Religion and Society” and “Ethics and Society” PhD programs, on another. Whatever the case may be, it seems to me that these traditional foundational issues are increasingly being brought into conversation with concrete practical contexts (and I think this is inevitable…and for the good). The challenge for the field, however, is how to negotiate the realization that ethical issues—even very common issues—are often simply too complex and require too many specializations for one ethicist to handle adequately. Let me illustrate by looking at an apparently straightforward example:

One practical element of our everyday existence is our clothing. We get dressed every day…and y’all have done a decent job of that this morning. Yet, how many of us have really thought much about what we are wearing. Upon just a little reflection, it becomes clear that a sufficiently satisfying Christian ethic of clothing requires not only a rich biblical and theological account of the practical and symbolic purpose of clothes and financial stewardship (along with the relevant virtues and vices), but also a comprehensive understanding of cotton-farming practices, the chemical composition and production of a wide range of synthetic fibers, the manifold problems associated with dying both natural and synthetic cloth, the working conditions and labor laws in dozens of countries scattered around the world, the ever-changing global trade agreements and their effects, the multiple social functions of fashion, marketing strategies, aesthetics, consumption practices, etc, etc. Coming to grips with all of these aspects of the clothes we perfunctorily put on each morning would take several lifetimes. My point here is not that clothing is particularly unique; rather, my point is that our field is just beginning to come to grips with the complexity of the issues that face us every day.

What is increasingly needed (at least in my opinion), is a recognition that Christian ethics necessarily is a field where collaboration is ubiquitous, both in the classroom and in research [and, if we look at most influential books in the field and the publications in the Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics, this is an anomaly at present (i.e. multiple-authored volumes and articles are still the exception)...though the working groups here at the Annual Meetings seem to be a step in this direction]. Christian ethics cannot be a field where expertise in foundational or theoretical issues is considered sufficient or even pitted against expertise in practical or concrete issues; rather, it must be a field where these specializations mutually enrich one another. I take the recent arguments that make the case that ethics is theology to be one partial attempt at reconciling these matters. I also take the interest in various research “institutes” and “centers” among Christian ethicists to be directly and indirectly related to this these matters. Further, many of our graduate students seem to intuitively sense the need for diverse and complementary specializations in their education as they often apply to PhD programs not only for the faculty that teach ethics but also for the faculty that teach in relevant areas of specializations (e.g. faculty in environmental studies programs or in “black church studies”). That said, my sense is that until we find ways of bringing these together more synthetically—and rewarding it—we should not be surprised if “hotel management,” “business ethics,” “pastoral ethics,” etc, find that they can take care of their own affairs without recourse to what those in our field have to offer. And, this brings me to my final comment…

3. Competing Modes of Validation. Related to the above, I want to raise the question of how work in our field is validated. Of course, the SCE is an academic organization. But, my sense of what counts as “academic” is tilted in a direction that affirms certain forms of discourse and certain themes of discourse. At present, we find considerable overlap in Christian ethics with the fields of theology, philosophy, and the social sciences. At the same time, we find almost no overlap with the field of practical theology. I do not want to hazard my speculations—at least publicly—as to why this is the case. But, I do want to suggest an observation that I think may be relevant here...though I do so very provisionally (and you will see why in a moment). Well, here goes, and it returns to the documented hiring energy displayed by Catholic institutions: Catholic
moral theology usually finds itself naturally within an overlapping academic, practical, and pastoral constituency. That is not to say that everything is daisies and butterflies among moral theologians. Rather, it is to say that moral theologians can play by the rules of the academy while also having a self-understanding (rooted in a long traditional) that is not limited by the validations or repudiations of the academy. Protestant Christian ethicists, at least as I see it, have a harder time finding a meaningful context for validation beyond the academy. I am sure there are exceptions. But, my worry is that the necessity of academic validation continues, both subtly and profoundly, to shape what “counts” or what “matters” to Protestant Christian ethicists to an excessive extent. And, if this is right, then we—as a field—need to think long and hard about what “counts” and what “matters” to us…

Well, perhaps I am wrong about this (and perhaps I’m wrong about all of the above!)…and I hope I am wrong about this. As I read it, the SCE 2020 Committee Report on “The Future of Christian Ethics” is an illuminating and ambitious report that serves as a provocative instigation for further conversation. For that I am most grateful. I have attempted to push the conversation this morning by suggesting that the future of our field also rests on how we come to grips (a) with the lack of a “center” in an increasingly large field, (b) with the increasing diversity and specialization required to do our jobs appropriately, and (c) with the ways in which the field validates the work that we do. In conclusion, I want, again, to thank the committee for taking these matters seriously, for bringing them to our attention, and for taking the time to listen. Thank you.

Response to SCE 2020 Committee Report on the Future of Christian Ethics
Elise M. Edwards, Baylor University
January 10, 2014

Thank you for asking me to respond to this report. I am excited to have an opportunity to reflect on the future of the SCE and Christian Ethics broadly and share my perspective among those I respect. I am a junior scholar in the field, so my remarks reflect my enthusiasm for making a living doing something I love, my limited experience, my hopes for a long career, as well as my institutional location. This December, I completed my first semester as a full-time faculty member. Although I have worked with graduate students in the past when I was adjuncting, I work with undergraduates at Baylor, a Baptist university, and this setting has influenced the way I understand my role as a Christian ethicist and educator and my perceptions of the future for our work. Yet the role of undergraduate teaching was largely absent from the report.

I maintain convinced of the importance of Christian ethical discourse alongside other forms of religious and secular ethical inquiry. Our difficult task in the present and future is to prepare our members, colleagues, and students to critically address complex contemporary societal issues from a Christian perspective with integrity, conviction tempered by humility, and acknowledgement of divergent views within Christianity and among other faiths. Yet in the preface to the report, Charles Mathewes writes:

[S]ome of us suspect that there is some evidence to suggest that… over the past few decades, the field of Christian Ethics has become too firmly a “field”—professionally distinct, and disciplinarily reflexive, in a way too much like other academic fields…. Given that “Christian Ethics” has, at least on many received understandings, a vocational responsibility to the Christian churches, such an “academic captivity” may mean that something has been lost, alongside the many gains. (2020 SCE Committee Report (Draft),” pp 5-6.)
In my brief remarks today, I would like to respond to this provocative statement and suggest some issues that the membership survey about practices and pedagogy might consider. I believe that our work is necessary to act as a critical conscience for Christian institutions and communities, and to the broader society as well. There are methods of inquiry, theoretical arguments, and scholarly conversations we consider that make us professionally distinct and disciplinarily reflexive, and this is a good thing, but as we move into the future, we must continue to be intentional about engaging with established thinkers and emerging thinkers (that is, our students and those outside the academy) in other fields.

This impression I have is confirmed in everyday conversations and in the classroom. Let me briefly describe what happens when I tell people what I do for a living. I’m sure many of you have had similar responses to the ones I’ve had these past few months when I tell strangers that I teach Christian Ethics. Generally, the reactions I’ve gotten fall into two categories: confusion and affirmation. Of course, there are those who have no idea that one can become an ethicist. As the discussion progresses, there is generally some interest. The more relevant responses to my point here about our engagement with broader society come from those who affirm our relevance. When I say I teach Christian Ethics, the most common response is something like, ”Ooooh, we really need that!” The response conveys a few different sentiments, which usually depends on who my conversation partner means with the term “we.”:

• Concerns about moral laxity in Christian leadership
• Concerns about moral decline, decay, or relativism among Christians in light of the surrounding culture
• Concerns about whether the church has anything relevant to say on social issues
• Concerns about the seemingly uninformed and uncritical positions that Christians adopt (e.g. responses I have heard after the comments by the Duck Dynasty patriarch.)

My undergraduate students have helped me see a much broader scope for these last two points. I’ve become aware that my class is a valuable space for helping them think more intentionally about the connection between their Christian faith, their vocation in the world, and their action in society. (I don’t mean to overstate my significance here, but to say that I was surprised by the enthusiasm and thirst with which the students I have encountered undertake the ethical task. About half of my students are religion majors or minors – I expect them to be interested in the practical, real world implications of their faith. But the other half of my students intend to practice law, medicine, various types of business, and other professions outside the religious sphere. They are grateful to have space in their lives and in full curricula to think about how they will approach the increasingly complex issues of their professional and personal lives in a way that is integrated with their faith. My point here is that we should see the undergraduate classroom as a space of critical engagement with other disciplines.
Looking at topics that will be presented and taken up at these meetings, it is clear that the scholarship of the members of the SCE crosses disciplinary boundaries. Our research addresses contemporary issues and provides frameworks and approaches for the ethical task. I am certain we as individuals do this in classes and institutional settings. But I am concerned that as a society, we do not have enough discussions about how to be ethicists and educators who make a difference to those outside our discipline. There is a pressing need to demonstrate and teach critical thinking about the topics that threaten our social fabric and the cohesion that could exist despite divergence and distinct identities within Christian institutions. The most pressing issues are some of those that we address here at the Annual Meetings:

• Sexuality
• War, terrorism, and police and state violence
• Environmental degradation and consumerist values
• Healthcare, autonomy, privacy, and the role of government and other institutions in securing patients’ rights
• Poverty and economic disparity

Although we address these issues, as a society of Christian ethicists, we should also be addressing how to participate and equip our communities and institutions to deal with these controversial topics. The membership survey on pedagogy and practices could be a useful tool for exploring this. Today’s intellectual climate may lack the “vibrant presence of Protestant liberal arts colleges in the 1960s and 70s” (referred to in the survey committee’s report), but ethics courses will continue to be a part of many undergraduate programs out of necessity, and perhaps there is a cooperative role for Christian ethicists in some of those. We should be strategic about our pedagogy and the types of courses we create and lead.

Finally, if we are to be relevant to a broader society, we need to be intentional about cultivating and nurturing the diversity present within our society. Discussions about how to build and defend diversity of thought, experience, background, and research interests within our society are crucial. The survey may help us understand how we perceive current efforts and what tensions remain unresolved. It is my hope that the great work the committee began may continue.
Appendix F.3:
Enabling a Family-Friendly Institution: Creative Practices

The shape and demography of the academy has changed significantly in the past twenty-five years. Increases in the numbers of women have considerably changed the shape of scholarship and the face of the Academy. Notwithstanding the increased numbers, the fields of Christian Ethics and Religious Studies, and the academy as a whole, have seen minimal changes in the status such persons attain. For example, women continue to hold the majority of adjunct, instructor, and lecturer positions.[1] True Diversity among tenure-track faculty remains an elusive goal. In 1975 women made up 22.5% of full-time faculty; in 2001, they accounted for just 36%. Only 26% of tenured professors are women and only 19% of tenured professors at doctoral institutions are women. Among full-time professors, 48% of women, versus 68% of men, are tenured. [2] In the field of theology/religion, while the number of women with Ph.D.s has increased (to 38% in 1996), the number of women hired for tenure track positions has actually declined.[3] Today it is frighteningly easy to look around in job searches, departments, journals, and professional meetings and ask, “Where are the women?”

While there are many factors behind the disproportionate representation of white males in doctoral research institutions and tenured jobs across institutions of higher education, we would like to focus our attention on one of the most significant. Women are opting out of the academy or failing to thrive once they get in because they spend much more of their time caring for family members than men do.

Family care is an issue that affects women throughout their lives. Women are more likely to drop out of graduate school, either because they are already in the midst of child bearing and cannot complete their work or because they see the compromises the future would require them to make and choose another field.[4] Among those who graduate, many are less competitive, because they have less time for research.[5] A large number end up as adjunct professors, with or without terminal degrees.[6] At the interview stage, colleges receive significantly fewer female than male applications and hire more men than women.[7]

Once inside the academy, women’s family care is directly linked to their difficulty in achieving tenure, advancing to the rank of full professor, and holding powerful administrative positions.[8] “Currently, the task of balancing family and career tends to fall disproportionately to women. Childbearing, childbirth, child rearing, child care, care for dependent relatives with disabilities or medical needs, and elder care are all “family” related responsibilities predominantly shouldered by women. Increasingly, men are seeking to share this responsibility but they are discovering what many women already know. Despite lip service to the contrary, society at large and their place of work frequently discourage, if not penalize, those who make such efforts. “The conflict between work and family obligations that many faculty members experience is more acute for women faculty than men.”[9] Thus, addressing this conflict is crucial to achieving diversity.

The creation of family-friendly departments is of relevance to academic societies because it directly concerns issues of equity and equal opportunity in academic life. For this reason, in November 2001, the American Association of University Professors adopted a “Statement of Principles on Family Responsibility” that encouraged higher education institutions and academic societies to use their principles and guidelines “to construct appropriate policies and practices
regarding family leaves, modified teaching schedules, ‘stopping the tenure clock,’ and institutional assistance for family responsibilities.”[10]

The Women’s Caucus believes the Society of Christian Ethics should promote the adoption of policies and guidelines that foster family-friendly departments and thereby positively contribute to increased diversity within our field. We believe the endorsement of such creative practices falls directly within the mission of the Society of Christian Ethics, which, is to promote scholarly work . . . in the relation of Christian ethics . . . to social, economic, political and cultural problems; to encourage and improve the teaching of these fields in colleges, universities and theological schools; and to provide a community of discourse and debate for those engaged professionally within these general fields . . . . At the same time, the Society addresses in national and global contexts problems in applied and professional ethics, and various human rights and social justice issues.

The inequitable representation of women in the academy as a whole, and Christian ethics in particular, hinders the growth and diversity of the “community of discourse and debate” the Society seeks to foster. Support for increased diversity will “encourage and improve the teaching” within the field, which is a direct application of “applied and professional ethics” in response to particular “social justice issues” in our field and the wider academy.

Fostering more family-friendly departments directly impacts our academic life together and our ability to fulfill our mission:

As institutions of higher education seek to hire and retain high quality faculty, they compete not only with other colleges and universities but also with employers outside the academy. In fact, research suggests that institutions that do not accommodate family caregiving suffer in the competitive academic workplace.[11] Thus, how academic institutions approach such matters quite literally impacts not only who is able but also who is willing to pursue the academic study of Christian ethics. This in turn affects both the quantity and diversity of our profession, the Society’s membership, and consequently, the shape of our annual programs. Other academic societies have made precisely these sorts of recommendations because they understand how powerfully such policies and practices influence their fields of study.[12]

The creative practices presented in this document offer benefits and encourage restructuring based on the needs of those who provide primary care regardless of gender. However, in everyday use, women disproportionately require such benefits because they do most of the care. As a result, many of the benefits are construed as creating a “mommy track” – women who perform majority of childrearing duties – and a “daughter” track – women who perform the majority of elder care duties. These gender assumptions discourage the use of benefits. For example, the tenure clock problem has largely been solved at the policy level, as most schools offer, but don't require, extensions. Yet, most faculty do not feel comfortable taking extensions. This is an academic culture problem. One step to changing this culture is for academic societies like the SCE to collectively support creative practices, such as those outlined below.

As a number of other professional organizations have done, the Women’s Caucus of the Society of Christian Ethics is recommending a number of guidelines and practices that seek to enable family-friendly departments. The guidelines fall within three different categories: (1) specific practices for academic departments, (2) employee benefits programs provided by institutions, and (3) legal regulations.

DEPARTMENTAL PRACTICES
Within academic departments, small changes can have a significant impact on the creation of a family-friendly environment. Many of these changes can be implemented by department chairs, professional school deans, and consensus votes at department meetings. Other more influential changes require a mix between institutional policy and department practice. We recommend that all policies of an institution or department be written, formal policies that are well-monitored. Such provisions reduce the creation of a separate (mommy/daughter) track and increase communication and full disclosure about expectations. When policies are not formally written they tend to overlap between department practice and institutional support, for this reason, we have listed policies that would benefit from formal regulation by higher education administration under Institutional Practices.

**Flexible work policies and schedules**
Flexible work policies seek to encourage departments to be aware of and to take into consideration those that have family-care related responsibilities. One obvious example of such a policy is the scheduling of faculty meetings from 4:00-6:00 PM. Most center-based care facilities close between 5:00 and 5:30 PM. Young children often eat dinner during those hours or shortly thereafter. In scheduling recurring meetings, classes, and other faculty obligations, departments should give priority to those balancing external time constraints of child and dependent care facility operation hours, school break schedules, and responsibilities such as breastfeeding or taking an elder parent or partner for medical treatments.

**Active service with modified duties**
Many academic departments offer the option of active service with modified duties for faculty members. Modified duty plans respond to the need for a faculty member to take care of a newborn or adopted child, to care for an elderly parent, or provide care for a partner. Reduction of or relief from teaching loads or service obligations while maintaining “active-service status” enables a faculty member to provide primary care to a newborn, emergency care to a dependent and transitional care to an elderly parent or partner. “The AAUP now recommends that the possibility of appointments with reduced loads be extended to all full-time faculty members, irrespective of their tenure status. The AAUP encourages institutions to explore the possibility of adopting policies providing for short-term periods of modified duties at full pay for family responsibilities.”[14] Departments can use active service with modified duties as a creative option for meeting continued needs within a department, while also recognizing the specific needs of faculty members in various ranks.

**INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES**

While individual departmental members may not be able to change institutional policy, each should be aware of possible institutional creative practices as well as the need to monitor the implementation of such policies so that it happens in an equitable manner within one’s department. Department members, especially hiring committees should make themselves aware of the child and other family care benefits available through human resources or work-life offices on campus. In addition, recommendations can be made to these institutional offices based on the needs of employees and for the purposes of faculty retention and hiring. It is recommended that the appropriate institutional offices be made aware of Colleges and Universities Work Family Association (CUWFA). This network shares information and resources on how to offer better work-life policies.

**The tenure clock**
For pre-tenure faculty, family and career conflicts tend to “occur just when the research and publication demands of the tenure process are most onerous, and when many faculty members
have responsibilities for infants and young children.”[15] Institutions should allow for flexibility in the tenure clock for faculty members providing primary care to a newborn, newly adopted child, or a child, partner, or parent who suffers an acute medical crisis or needs transitional care. A number of institutions have currently created policies that automatically provide female and male faculty alike with a one-year tenure-track extension for the birth or adoption of a child. We recommend automatic extensions. Offering the provision to both men and women reduces the assumption of tenure clock extensions creating a “mommy track”. However, any faculty member, male or female, can turn down the extension. In the event such an extension is granted, the candidate should be judged by the same standards as someone who has not extended their clock. Thus, “institutions should guard against imposing greater demands on a faculty tenure candidate as a consequence of his or her having extended the absolute time from the year of appointment to the year of tenure review.”[16]

We recommend adopting a clear definition of “primary caregiver” to reduce the risk of abuse of tenure clock extensions. Harvard Law School uses the following definition: any faculty member who is “the sole caretaker of his or her newborn or newly adopted child at least 20 hours per week, from Monday through Friday, between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.” can qualify.[17]

**Extended paid leave**

36% of higher education institutions offer only the federally-mandated unpaid Family Medical Leave Act benefit. Most paid parental leave policies are found in “elite, private schools” with around 51% offering paid leave. 34% of private schools offer some form of paid leave, while only 18% of state schools offer paid leave. Overall, 26% of higher education institutions “offer some paid leave above a six-week maternity leave – either women-only or both-eligible.” For the most part, schools provide full relief of duties and expect no research during leave – except for elite schools, where paid leaves require some level of departmental duties and research is expected to continue.[18]

Paid leave should be available to those who choose to care for a family member (child, spouse, or parent) with a serious health condition, or for self-care needed because of an employee's own serious health condition. In this way, paid leave policies simply extend the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) intentions with increased benefits to all necessary categories of family caregiving and prevent discrimination. Paid leaves can range from full pay for half of the FMLA twelve-week standard (six weeks paid, six unpaid) to up to a semester or year depending on institutional need and financial ability.

**Emergency care and other short-term leave**

We recommend departments and individual faculty become aware of the various kinds of unpaid leaves to address family emergencies beyond the traditional circumstances of giving birth, adopting, or providing long-term dependent care. Many employers allow employees to extend sick leave benefits during leaves to include care for an ill family member.

**Childcare and Other Family Care**

Many institutions may already or should be encouraged to provide flexible spending accounts as an employee benefit. These spending accounts shelter up to $5000 of pre-tax salary monies for dependent care or $3000 for medical care expenses.

In addition to or independent of that benefit, many higher education institutions can offer subsidized childcare options or preferential slots at on-campus childcare facilities or affiliated facilities within the city or town. Work/Life (or human resources) offices often work to create a
network of area providers accredited and licensed by the state as a resource to employees seeking childcare options other than center-based facilities.

In addition, institutions working toward a family-friendly work environment should seek to design back-up care or emergency care options at their centers, through homecare provider networks or using a voucher system. Subsidies and vouchers should be provided based on size of household and income.

Institutions should offer the same subsidies, offer preferential admittance, or create affiliated networks for elder care or dependent (physical or mental disability) care. Such care-giving responsibilities often fall primarily to mid-career or senior faculty members and are not usually recognized under policy guidelines because it is assumed that these faculty do not have “care” duties because they do not have young children.

**FEDERAL REGULATIONS**

There are two main federal laws that govern sex discrimination, dependent care, and disability leaves. The federal and state laws provide minimum requirements. The federal laws are worth noting since, “one in three academic institutions have parental-leave policies that violate federal anti-discrimination law.”[19] We encourage departments to carefully scrutinize their institutions’ adherence to the following Federal regulations.

The **Pregnancy Discrimination Act**[20] is an amendment to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth or related medical conditions constitutes unlawful sex discrimination under Title VII. Women affected by pregnancy or related conditions must be treated in the same manner as other applicants or employees with similar abilities or limitations.[21]

This legislation also provides reference for **Disability Leaves** for pregnancy-related conditions. Disability leaves must be equal for men and women. In other words, “employers cannot legally place arbitrary six- or eight-week limits, require stricter notification periods, or offer less pay and less teaching relief for pregnancy than for other temporarily disabling conditions. In short, the key to designing a good childbirth-leave plan is to treat pregnancy the same as any other temporary disability both in terms of written policy and in terms of practice.”[22]

The **Family Medical Leave Act of 1993**[23] allows employees to take job-protected, unpaid leave for up to a total of 12 work weeks in response to the birth or adoption of a child, to care for a newborn child, to care for a family member (child, spouse, or parent) with a serious health condition, or procure the care needed because of an employee's own serious health condition. The federal laws suggest policy regulations that seek to serve the majority of persons across professions. For many, pregnancy is not a “disability”; for many childbirth is much less medically disabling than experiencing surgery, a broken bone, or treatment for a long-term illness. The federal regulations should be seen as a minimum standard and automatic right. One has the right to take less time, but departments and institutions should also be aware that policies offering more time with modified duties can in fact be more helpful.

**SUMMARY**

As the SCE Women’s Caucus, we are interested in the development of our field, encouraging new and deeper scholarship, as well as being attentive to larger justice claims. Given the data on how family-friendly policies, or lack thereof, directly affect the diversity of our academic departments
and the availability of our members' time for scholarly growth, we recommend the above creative practices.

The guidelines and policies proposed fall within three different categories and raise unique opportunities to tailor family-friendly policies to institutional and departmental characteristics. Notwithstanding some individualizing of policies, all institutions should at minimum follow federal regulations for anti-discrimination and leave policies. Most of these options should be available to all staff, graduate and postdoctoral students, as well as faculty where appropriate. We acknowledge that implementing family-friendly policies within a department or institution is beyond the reach of an academic society. However, the collation and promotion of creative practices as standards by which the SCE’s membership can foster growth and encourage diversity within our field directly relates to the on-going fulfillment of our mission.


[5] Ibid.


[7] Miles, 104, relying on a 1998-99 study by Richard Rosengarten for the Council of Graduate Studies in Religion, who found that on institutions received about 70% of applications from men and 30% from women. Of those hired, 60% were male, 40% female.


[10] Ibid.

A list of academic societies involved in such projects follows: Association for Women in Mathematics (AWM), Caucus for Women in Statistics, Committee on the Status of Women in Physics, Association for Women Geoscientists (AWG), American Medical Women’s Association (AMWA), Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology (COSWA), Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS), American Sociological Association (ASA) , American Medical Association's Women Physicians Congress (WPC), American Medical Association (AMA). The American Academy of Religion’s permanent commission on the Status of Women in the Profession is currently addressing issues of hiring and retention of women faculty.


Ibid.

Ibid.

Ibid.


The Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-3), Code of Federal Regulations Pertaining to ESA, Title 29 Labor, Chapter V Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, Part 825.
Appendix F.4:
Balancing Scholarship with Family Care: A Guide
Commissioned by the Women’s Caucus of the
Society of Christian Ethics

Purpose:
The field of Christian ethics is slowly changing, and it is beginning to include more women and men who have responsibility for the care of dependent family members. Caring for young children is perhaps the most visible issue, but many in our field also struggle to care for sick or elderly partners, siblings, parents, or grandparents. Without a doubt, the road to tenure is more difficult for these scholars, and yet their presence in the field is of great value. This guide is offered to younger scholars with the hope that they may benefit from what others have learned.

Educate yourself: know your legal rights & what questions to ask about family-friendly practices:
*See “The Balancing Act,” a regular column in the Chronicle of Higher Education (online for a subscription fee at http://chronicle.com/)
*Resources available (mostly for free) from the American Association of University Professors are compiled at http://www.aaup.org/Issues/FamilyWork/index.htm.

If you’re in graduate school:
*It seems that there is no perfect time to have a baby. Some studies suggest that graduate students who have babies are less likely to finish their programs. However, some SCE members have had children in graduate school and done just fine. The key is finding an arrangement that will give you enough time for your baby and your work. Supportive partners and other relatives (some with flexible schedules) have been enormously helpful to many of our members.
*A top priority is finding out how your funding will be affected if you take a reduced course load or temporary leave for the birth of a baby or care for a sick family member. If you use university-sponsored health insurance, investigate how your eligibility/fees will be affected by a change in your enrollment status. Many programs have no written policies, although it is possible that you may be able to negotiate an individualized plan. If your school has an active graduate student association, they might be able put you in contact with other students who have negotiated to maintain at least part of their funding while taking a leave or a reduced course load. A good advisor may also be able to help you find funding that will enable you to concentrate on research rather than earning money.
*If you’re still completing coursework, and if there is a consortium of several schools available, consider taking a course each semester at a school that operates on a different schedule from your home school. For instance, if your home school has a fall semester that ends in mid-December, and another school has courses that end in early January, you can stagger your final projects so that they aren’t all due simultaneously.
*Investigate with other students & recent alumni of your program to find a dissertation director who will be your advocate. You want someone who will usher you through the process efficiently, not someone with a track record of ignoring phone calls, procrastinating about reviewing drafts, or insisting that students read every obscure source even remotely relating to their dissertation topic. Ask your director to help you choose a manageable topic, and to craft your dissertation in a format as close as possible to a publishable book style.
*Likewise, if you will work as a teaching or research assistant, investigate the track record of various faculty mentors. Request to be paired with one who will assign you a modest amount of work, not one who has a reputation for overburdening graduate assistants.

*If you will teach courses of your own while working on a dissertation, offer to teach in time slots with a pattern of lower enrollment.

*Graduate student with family care responsibilities are often at a disadvantage during the hiring process because they have not presented papers or published articles at the same rate as their unencumbered peers. Making time for these activities is crucial to your future success.

*Learn how to be frugal. Check the internet using words like ‘voluntary simplicity,’ ‘frugal,’ or ‘tightwad’ to find websites with household money-saving tips. Let friends and relatives know you prefer practical gifts, rather than large toys. Contrary to what parenting magazines lead new parents to believe, your child does not need the best of everything. There’s nothing wrong with shopping at consignment stores; store brand diaper wipes, diaper cream, oatmeal, and medicine work just as well as name-brands; your baby can sleep in a play pen just as well as in an expensive crib. Consider seeking alternative housing arrangements—for instance, one SCE member earned her apartment in exchange for a modest amount of work as live-in staff for a Ronald McDonald house.

*Impoverished graduate students with children may be eligible for local, state, and federal benefits such as Medicaid, WIC, reduced-fare passes on public transit, childcare vouchers, or reduced fees at summer camps for school-age children. You may be able to receive a free car seat (even upgraded as your child grows) from your local fire or police department.

*If you want to take a few years off to have or care for children or other family members, it may be possible to do this during or after graduate school and return to full-time tenure-track work. Publishing during this time is ideal. Several SCE members have used this strategy successfully.

As you interview for jobs:

*Get the inside story on how family-friendly each institution is. You may want to be discreet about where you seek information. The people who are evaluating your application (i.e., the department or search committee chairs) may not be the best people to ask. They may not know their institution’s policies on family support, and their knowledge of your family status might negatively impact their evaluation of you as an applicant. Informative, unbiased sources include the institution’s website and personnel office. A university’s women’s center or Affirmative Action office may be better sources for information about domestic partner issues.

*If you check faculty web pages for the department where you are interviewing, you may learn which members have children. Or, if you wait until you arrive for a campus interview, you can try to see which faculty have photos of children in their offices, and then speak to them one-on-one. Try to get a sense of departmental expectations regarding “face time” and service expectations for junior faculty. It is probably unwise to introduce the subject of family-friendly practices during portions of the interview that involve larger groups of faculty.

*If there are no faculty with children in the department where you interview, you might ask the personnel office if they can connect you with faculty members from other departments who have young children.

*Check the institution’s website for information about criteria for promotion and tenure. Here, and from the personnel office, you may learn whether the institution provides paid family leave; or allows tenure clock extensions, a half-time tenure track option, or modified duties for periods of intense family care. Most importantly, investigate how often faculty actually use these options, and still succeed at earning tenure. Studies have documented that at some institutions, faculty are implicitly (or explicitly) discouraged from utilizing the benefits to which they are officially entitled. Finding a working environment in which family care is valued is crucial.

When you get an offer, be prepared to negotiate:
At this point—especially if you’re fortunate enough to have multiple offers—the balance of power shifts a bit. Out of dozens of candidates, the department has chosen you. They want you to take their offer. Look up competing institutions on the web and find out what they offer. Then consider asking if your institution can sweeten the deal with family-friendly accommodations, such as:

* Relocation assistance scaled to family size.
* Health insurance that begins when you arrive in your new city, even if this is several weeks before the start of classes.
* Reduced course load for your first semester, a delay in advising obligations until your 2nd year, the ability to repeat courses in fall and spring semesters, or to teach accelerated/summer courses as part of your regular load—these measures will help spread your workload, and may also reduce your need for paid childcare.
* Flexible scheduling that takes family care responsibilities into account. For instance, if you have young children at home or an elderly parent who lives a long drive away, will your department allow you to teach all of your courses on Tuesday and Thursdays?
* A position for a partner who is an academic.

Academics are particularly challenged by family care issues because our jobs often involve moving away from family. If you are considering multiple offers, do not underestimate the benefit of nearby friends & extended family. You may be happier working at a less prestigious school closer to your loved ones than you would be at a better-known school far away from your support network.

On the other hand, if you’re considering multiple offers, don’t assume that a larger, research oriented university will be more demanding than a smaller one. At a smaller school, you will probably have a heavier teaching load, more course preps, and heavier service expectations, because there are fewer colleagues to share the work. A larger university is also more likely to have supports such as paid maternity leave, better salaries and health insurance plans, on-campus daycare, and graduate research assistants.

**On the Tenure Track:**

* Remain in contact with mentors from graduate school who may: give you feedback on your writing, introduce you to others in your field, help you find places to publish your work, and/or provide syllabi for classes you will be asked to teach.
* Find mentors at your new institution who are engaged in family care. You may want to join or initiate a conversation about combining academic work with caregiving. Talking to those at your institution or similar schools about strategies will be extremely helpful. For more general questions, the SCE Women’s Caucus offers mentors who are willing to give long distance advice.
* Studies of successful faculty tend to show the importance of consistent work on research, teaching, and service from the very beginning of a career. Don’t make the mistake of putting research on hold. Carve out a regular time for it and stick to it, as it will make or break you at tenure time at most institutions. New faculty can be overwhelmed by the demands of teaching and service. Find graceful ways of saying no to new commitments. If possible, seek out funding for research leave that will help you stay on track.
* If you are considering extending the tenure clock, talk to others at your institution. The extra time may be valuable to you, as long as others in your institution do not look unfavorably upon your choice. Some faculty chose not to extend, because they do not want to wait for the extra money and security that tenure brings.
* If your institution does not offer paid family leave, request it. Talk to other faculty members who have received paid leave, and learn from their strategies. Often, department chairs and deans will negotiate. Tell them that the best institutions offer one semester of paid leave.
* Recent studies still show that the majority of academic women bear primary responsibility for home and child care. If you have a partner, work toward shared responsibility for care.
*Caregivers can easily forget to care for themselves. Even though you think you don’t have time for yourself, it is important to take some.

*Become an advocate for university policies and an academic culture that values family care. Things are much better now than thirty years ago because women and men have pushed for changes, dared to say no to unreasonable demands, and asked for accommodations that allowed them to enjoy their families. Continuing the process is a crucial part of seeking more diverse faculties and more balanced lives.