

**ASTR**  
*American Society for Theatre Research*

**Minutes of the Fall 2010 ASTR Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Renaissance Seattle Hotel, Seattle WA**  
**18 November 2010**

Present: Rhonda Blair (President), Stacy Wolf (Vice President), Wendy Arons (Secretary), Tobin Nellhaus (Treasurer), Nancy Erickson (Administrator, *ex officio*), Charlotte McIvor (GSC Representative), Kimi Johnson (GSC Representative-elect), Brandi Catanese, Sandra Richards, Penny Farfan, Patricia Ybarra, Dorothy Chansky, Mike Sell, Laura Edmondson, Susan Bennett, Scott Magelssen, Rebecca Schneider, Ramon Rivera-Servera, Daphne Lei, Gay Cima (EC member-elect), Brian Herrera (EC member-elect), Heather Nathans (EC member-elect), Mechele Leon (CC member-elect)

The President called the meeting to order at 8:20 a.m. Introductions were made.

**1. Adoption of the Minutes of the Spring 2010 Executive Committee Meeting**

**MOTION:** to approve the Minutes of the Spring 2010 EC Meeting, including subsequent e-votes. Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Catanese. **Motion passed by acclamation.**

**2. Adoption of the Agenda**

**MOTION:** to adopt the agenda prepared by the President for the Fall 2010 EC Meeting. Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Catanese. **Motion passed by acclamation.**

**3. President's Report – Blair**

a) New EC members: The President welcomed newly elected EC members Gay Cima, Elinor Fuchs, Heather Nathans, and Brian Herrera, and the new GSC representative Kimi Johnson.

b) Necrology: The President acknowledged the passing of Vera Mowry Roberts, Helen Krich Chinoy, Oscar Brockett and George Woodyard; at the Annual General Meeting words of remembrance for these departed members of ASTR will be offered by David Savran, Rhonda Blair, Charlotte Canning, and Patricia Ybarra.

c) Ad Hoc Committee on New Paradigms in Graduate Education: The President thanked Nathans for her work on this initiative. Nathans noted that the initiative came out of earlier conversations, especially the conference organized by Esther Kim Lee, and from Nathans own experience as Associate Dean at the University of Maryland. The purpose behind the committee's work is to help graduate programs adapt to the changing economic situation and job market. ASTR needs to reach out and be a clearinghouse and

source of support for institutions trying to move toward future, provide information so that programs don't have to reinvent the wheel. The President noted that a wide range of responses have come in response to the committee's initial report, and she sees the document as a ground to begin a conversation. Time has been set aside after lunch to begin that conversation as an EC.

d) Fundraising: The President stated that she is hoping to ramp up fundraising again this year, and asked the EC to reflect on what our priorities are for fundraising. In particular, she requested that members of the EC help her formulate ways she could appeal more specifically to the membership to inspire them to donate.

e) Membership cycles: Now that we have moved to online membership renewal, there is some confusion about membership cycles, and some members are missing issues of *Theatre Survey* due to the timing of their renewal. We may need to have a grace period for those whose membership has lapsed during the time the journal comes out. A proposal for policy on this may be coming to the EC for electronic vote between our Fall and Spring meetings.

f) Additional matters: The President directed the EC's attention to the quarterly report submitted before the meeting, and asked if there were any questions or concerns. None were voiced.

#### **4. Secretary's Report--Wendy Arons**

a) The Secretary thanked EC members for their timely responses to EC business, electronic communications have been very smooth in the interim between meetings.

b) GSC Representative McIvor noted that incoming GSC Representative Kimi Johnson needs to be added to the Secretary's email distribution list.

#### **5. Vice-President's Report--Stacy Wolf**

a) 2011 Conference: plans for this Conference, to be held in Montreal, are underway. Program Chair Nic Ridout has drafted a call for papers which is included in registration packets.

b) 2012 Conference: Program Chairs Patricia Ybarra & Patrick Anderson are already working on the 2012 Conference to be held in Nashville.

c) Committee on Conferences: The Vice President thanked outgoing member Daphne Lei for her work on the Committee on Conferences, and welcomed Mechele Leon and Laura Edmondson to the Committee. The Vice President requested that EC and CC members practice a heightened awareness of the "big picture" at this year's conference, note what is working well, and in particular that they provide feedback on both the collaboration with CORD and the Concurrent Paper Panels that were introduced this year. She also noted that she will be advocating for an unthemed conference in 2013, but will consult with the Committee on Conferences on this matter as well.

## 6. Treasurer's Report--Tobin Nellhaus

a) Financial overview: The Treasurer reported that the organization's financial situation is good. Our investments are recovering from the crash, and this year's high conference attendance might mean some extra revenue for the organization at the end of the conference. We do not yet have figures from the restructuring of investments to more Socially Responsible investing, so he was not able to report on the results of that move. He noted that at some point we need to have a conversation about how we conceptualize our investments, but this can be deferred to the Spring meeting.

How we pay for investment fees is an issue. There is no policy in place for handling the .75% investment fee charged by the investment company. The practice to date has been to pay those fees out of the money market account; this past year, there were not enough funds in the money market account to cover the fees and as a result the Treasurer had to liquidate some mutual funds to cover the fees. At that point, he realized that there was no policy governing this issue. Because this issue represented a conflict of interest for the Treasurer, he recused himself during the EC discussion and voting on this issue, although he was called back into the room during the discussion to clarify past practice and answer questions about the budgetary impact of the EC's decision.

b) **MOTION:** to amend the Spending Policy in the Handbook under Section VII.C.5(d)(v) to read: "The maximum annual withdrawal from the portfolio is 4% of the trailing three-year average of the portfolio's value as of December 31 of each year *plus investment fees*." The EC will review this policy in November 2012. Moved by Blair, seconded Arons. **Vote: 15 yes, 1 no, 0 abstentions. The motion carried.**

In discussion, members of the EC noted that the investment fees either need to be paid out of revenue or out of investments. The policy as adopted has an impact on the investment portfolio, particularly if the portfolio is not earning 4.75% interest to cover the annual withdrawals. Members agreed that the impact of this policy is something that the current Treasurer and new Treasurer should track so that it can be reviewed in 2012.

c) **MOTION:** to add the following statement to the Spending Policy in the Handbook under Section VII.C.5(d)(v): "The Treasurer's previous actions in paying investment management fees were consistent with the Executive Committee's intentions in establishing the Spending Policy." Moved by Chansky, seconded Farfan. **16 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. The motion carried.**

Upon his return the Treasurer announced that a full budget would come with the Administrator's Report later in the meeting.

## 7. Archivist's Report—Heather Nathans

Nathans called attention to the new finding aid for the ASTR archives and expressed a desire to have a link to the finding aid posted on the ASTR website for requests for archive materials. The curator of the archive at UMD is Vin Novaro. Nathans asked for clarification about how the funds ASTR has budgeted for the archives are disbursed; Novaro has used funds to create the finding aid, but has not received any money from

ASTR since 2008. The Treasurer noted that we have allocated \$300 per year for the archives; the best mechanism would be an invoice to Nancy Erickson on an annual basis.

The Secretary asked for clarification about what happens to digital files sent to the Archives. Nathans explained that they are printed, boxed, and filed. The archive prefers to receive files digitally so that they can maintain the double record. Nathans noted that email files are posing something of a challenge, as they require redacting to remove sensitive information.

### **8. Graduate Student Caucus Report--Charlotte McIvor**

a) Current status: In response to the "New Paradigms" report the GSC is engaged in conversation about the profession and how to best provide resources for graduate students. There has been a big jump in the GSC facebook membership, perhaps as a result of the new website. There are a number of career sessions planned at the current conference to respond to concerns of graduate students, i.e. session about the job market, alternative careers, surviving the dissertation, jobs in the United Kingdom, how to present one's self in the market. The GSC has developed a bibliography of resources related to the information being presented at the career sessions; the GSC Representative passed around a copy of the bibliography to show the EC. The Ambassador program has been expanded, and this year a red ribbon at the bottom of nametags indicates Ambassadors. Some graduate students from CORD were also integrated into the Ambassador program and the GSC was hoping to recruit more during the conference.

b) Silent Auction: Jenna Kubly and Delilah Waters have put much effort into the silent auction and have solicited a large number of donations. They continue to fine tune the pricing of items, the first year prices seemed to be too high, last year many items sold too low, the hope is that there is the right mix of high and low price items this year. McIvor passed around the silent auction binder which contained 193 pages of donations.

The GSC Representative thanked the EC for continued support and also for continuing to authorize conference fee remissions, which enable more graduate student participation in the organization.

### **9. Nominating committee Report**

a) **MOTION** to accept the slate of candidates for the 2011 election included in the Nominating Committee Report. Moved by Blair, seconded by Nellhaus. **17 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. The motion carried.**

The President noted that when the Nominating Committee has identified a second candidate to run for Treasurer the EC will be asked to vote to approve that nomination via e-vote.

The President expressed thanks to John Lutterbie and to the Nominating Committee for their excellent work in composing a strong slate.

### **10. Administrator's Report—Nancy Erickson**

a) The Administrator passed around her report, and called attention to the registration numbers for this year's conference: it is our biggest conference ever with 570 registered in advance. She noted that Ashanti Pretlow, the Executive Director for CORD, informed her that many CORD members are also ASTR members. The membership numbers are also good—we currently have 561 members for the year. Erickson noted that her error in posting October 15 as the Early Registration deadline on the website may have prompted members to act on their membership renewals more quickly. Only about ten ASTR members still need to pay their conference registration fees.

The mentorship program ran into some challenges this year: we had double the number of mentees expected. It would be good for next year to have better plan in place; Mike Sell agreed to help organize it for Montreal. The Administrator urged EC members who did not yet have a mentee to come to the mentor breakfast on Friday and help make the mentees feel welcome; this is a good way to address the perception of ASTR as "cold" and "closed."

Career sessions: there was unexpected response to the career sessions, it was necessary to add an extra session on Surviving the Dissertation. Those who are leading the career sessions will get a boxed lunch to take into the session.

There were unexpected numbers of exhibitors (12) and advertisers; we exceeded the projected budget in both categories. The reasons for this are unclear: Is it because of CORD, the concurrent panels, the extra Working Sessions? Because of the unexpectedly high attendance, there will be a video/audio feed into South Room for overflow in plenary sessions. The room can hold 420-450, the overflow room can hold another 90.

CORD will have its annual meeting in Maxwell's; our annual meeting will be crowded, but the CORD members will not be there.

The President asked if the new policy with regard to conference fees seemed to have had an impact on the membership renewals. Nellhaus noted that last year 25 people attended the conference as non-members; by eliminating the inadvertent "discount" to attend the conference as a non-member, we've reduced that number to under 5. Erickson speculated that the change in the website may also have positively impacted member renewals, or perhaps the early deadline for registration. Some who have renewed are not attending the conference, but there is still a strong correlation between conference attendance and membership.

In response to a question from Farfan the Administrator confirmed that the lunchtime sessions are called "career sessions" and not "brown bags."

The Administrator announced that this year there will be a new person in charge of registration: Jessica Cerillo, from Seattle, who is also the manager of the Michael Chekhov Association.

## **11. Fellowships and Awards Report--Dorothy Chansky**

a) General report: The Director of Fellowships and Awards called attention to the trends in application numbers included in her report to help guide the EC's discussion of the motions included. She also raised the issue of the title of the Director of Fellowships and Awards, and noted the need for the EC to discuss this issue either later today, or in the Spring, or as an electronic discussion.

One award had no applications: the Grants for Researchers at Teaching Intensive Institutions. Durham, the award committee chair, suggested changing the name, and has been supportive of the award. But we don't seem to have a critical mass of members who fall into this category. The award is not thriving.

b) **MOTION:** The Grants for Researchers at Teaching Intensive Institutions should be eliminated, and the category folded into the list of suggestions for application criteria under the overall Research Fellowship rubric. Moved by Chansky, seconded by Nellhaus. **Vote: 3 yes, 12 no, 2 abstentions. The motion was struck down.**

c) **MOTION:** The Domestic Exchange Award and Visiting Scholar Award should be reconfigured as the Collaborative Research Award. Moved by Chansky, seconded by Blair. **Vote: 17 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. The motion carried.**

d) **MOTION:** to change the amount of the Collaborative Research Award to "up to \$1750 per year." Moved by Chansky, seconded by Sell. **Vote: 16 yes, 1 no, 0 abstentions. The motion carried.**

e) **MOTION:** The Banes and Cohen Committees become a single committee, adjudicating the Cohen Award annually and the Banes Prize biennially. Moved by Chansky, seconded by Blair. **Vote: 12 yes, 3 no, 1 abstention. The motion carried.**

f) **MOTION:** In the event that a person is chosen to receive more than one award to help defray the costs of attending the ASTR conference, that person will receive the money associated with the larger of the two awards but will be acknowledged as a winner of both. The relevant awards committees shall have the right to disburse monies unspent by the award recipient to support additional worthy applicants. This rule will not affect prizes given for publications. Moved by Chansky, seconded by Blair. **Vote: 17 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. The motion carried.**

g) **MOTION:** Members may not submit the same proposal for more than one non-publication award or fellowship in any one year. Moved by Chansky, seconded by Blair. **Vote: 0 yes, 17 no, 0 abstentions. The motion was struck down.**

h) **MOTION:** The same proposal may not win more than one non-publication award or fellowship in any one year. This notion nullifies the prior motion regarding receipt of conference travel awards. Moved by Blair, seconded by Lei. **Vote: 0 yes, 11 no, 6 abstentions. The motion was struck down.**

i) **MOTION:** That the “Grants for Researchers at Teaching-Intensive Institutions” be renamed “Grants for Researchers With Heavy Teaching Loads.” The following language should be used for the description of the award parameters: “...any scholar with a heavy teaching load and limited institutional support for scholarship. Heavy teaching load could be defined by a large number of classes per semester (e.g., 3 or more), courses with large numbers of students, labor-intensive teaching (e.g., service learning courses), etc.” Moved by Magelssen, seconded by Blair. **Vote: 16 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention. The motion carried.**

j) The Director of Awards and Fellowships noted that in light of decisions made today, she would like to re-think which committees adjudicate which awards, given that some committees have a heavier "load" than others. She asked if this was something she needed EC approval for; the President put this on the agenda for electronic discussion and vote between the fall and spring meetings.

## **12. Publications Committee Report--Susan Bennett**

a) Website: ASTR Online Editor Matt Omasta joined the discussion. The President noted that now that the structure of website oversight has changed, and we have split the duties of the Webmaster and the Editor, we will want to redefine and rewrite Jim Groom's contract. But we are not yet at a point where we have the information necessary to structure a change into his contract. Since his contract expires December 1, we will need to extend it in order to keep his services, and use the intervening time to analyze the best way to structure a new contract.

The Publications Committee Chair noted that it might be wise to think about drafting a contract for the Website Editor as well as the *Theater Survey* editors, since none of those positions are currently under any contractual relationship to ASTR.

Omasta noted that there had been a great deal of discussion about what the new website should look like, and that there are already pros and cons to it. The main challenge is that it has been a significant amount of work for both the Webmaster and for the group of editors. It is the equivalent of a non-peer reviewed journal in terms of work—the editors always updating and adding new content. The Webmaster, Jim Groom, is doing more than any one person might be aware of, because he gets requests from a number of constituents (the officers, the Administrator, the Director of Awards, and even general members) and he does not know what to say yes or no to. The current contract asks the webmaster to work once a month—but we're asking him to do things several times a week. His compensation may not be on par with what he's being asked to do. Omasta noted that he does not handle any of the technical aspects of the website, he has drawn a bright line between his job as 'editor' (collecting content, editing it) and Jim's job as Webmaster (creating and maintaining the structure of the website, posting content).

Omasta also noted that there are decisions that need to be made by the EC regarding the website. For example: the job bank—we haven't decided yet if it's a for-fee service, members-only, etc. We can't get that part of the website live and running until the EC has made a decision.

In response to Omasta's report, EC members offered some alternative suggestions for website management. Schneider inquired whether or not the website editor's institution might be able to provide webmastering support. Or, perhaps, if another institution with strong ASTR representation could provide that support for the organization. Bennett suggested that we will need a more close linkage between our website and that of Cambridge University Press, and that we might be able to turn to CUP for webmaster support. There are some functions of the website that could be hosted elsewhere.

Omasta noted that one feature that the committee thought would be exciting is the opportunity to respond to articles via the "comment" feature, but that's not been happening. Part of the challenge is you have to log in to see it. Herrera noted that it could be structured so that you can see the comments without login but need to login to post. Erickson suggested that members of the EC could take the lead on posting comments to get conversations started. Herrera also noted that the website could be used to bring readers from existing commenting communities to come into the conversation, and offered to discuss this with Matt.

Omasta reported that by the Spring meeting, there should be a replacement for him, as he will not be able to extend his contract another year.

Erickson suggested that in relooking at Webmaster contract, we should think about the look and feel of the website. Perhaps we should pay less to the webmaster, and pay the editor. If we want it to be a vibrant site, we may not be able to count on getting dedicated volunteer labor. Omasta noted that the AATE has a similar website, and they pay a team of three people to run it. If we want the website to be more than it is now, we need to consider compensating the editors.

b) Ad Hoc Committee on Website: The President commended Catanese and her committee of Bruce McConachie, Kimi Johnson, and Jim Peck for their commendable work on the website redesign. That committee has been essential in getting the website up and running, its work is done, and it will be disbanded with great thanks and appreciation. The President will be constituting a new subcommittee to look at the drafting of the Webmaster contract. Susan Bennett will chair, and the committee will consist of Matt Omasta, Kimi Johnson, and Nancy Erickson ex-officio. They'll be charged to draft a new contract for the February meeting. Susan will continue conversations with Cambridge and the committee can also explore other options.

c) **MOTION:** to extend Jim Groom's contract through 31 May 2011 as it stands. Moved by Blair, seconded by Bennett. **Vote: 17 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. The motion carried.**

d) **MOTION:** that copyright for content on the ASTR website be held by ASTR. Moved by Nellhaus, seconded Blair. **Motion was tabled by a vote of 17 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.**

e) **MOTION:** That the Executive Committee approve the disbursement of the fellowship monies for the *Theatre Survey* editors as three stipends of \$500 each, paid annually to the current Editor, Associate Editor, and Book Review Editor of the journal. Moved by Bennett, seconded by Chansky. After discussion, **the motion was tabled by a vote of 3 yes, 2 no, 11 abstentions, to be taken up at February meeting.**

f) **MOTION:** That the Executive Committee approve the appointment of Esther Kim Lee to the position of Associate Editor of *Theatre Survey*. Moved by Bennett, seconded by Richards. **Vote: 16 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. The motion carried.**

g) **MOTION:** That the Executive Committee approve the new five-year contract with Cambridge University Press and authorize the President to sign acceptance on behalf of the Society. Moved by Bennett, seconded by Blair. **Vote: 16 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. The motion carried.**

*Note: in each of the two previous motions an EC member was absent from the room.*

During discussion of the new contract, Bennett noted that five clauses in an addendum to the contract were not included with the contract posted to the website for the EC's review—these were clauses approved in 2008 pertaining to digitization; they are standard clauses that had already been approved by EC. Bennett will send a complete contract to the Secretary for posting to the website.

h) **Sally Hoffman from Cambridge University Press** joined the meeting to give an overview of online developments at the press.

- Theatre Survey* Digital Archive: all back issues of *Theatre Survey* from Vol. 1.1 have been digitized to the highest level of functionality. The archived issues are fully searchable, available in pdf and html, with fully linked references. This is not just an additional revenue stream for ASTR, but also an additional benefit of membership in ASTR. The archive will be rolled out next year, and ASTR members will have access to the entire archive, which should help strengthen the bond between members and the journal. It also opens new opportunities in terms of marketing. Institutions can purchase access to the full archive as a one-off purchase to have access in perpetuity.

- Cambridge Journals Online Redesign: CUP is one of the only publishers to have an online platform maintained inhouse. They redesign every few years. There is a good deal of functionality available that we're not yet taking advantage of: i.e., the option to include supplementary materials, "first view" (the ability to see the journal ahead of print), blogging/commenting on articles on line, widgets that allow the website to communicate with other websites. New functionalities with the new redesign include: easier navigation, quick citation downloading, the ability to have ASTR news on the website, the ability to link CUP to ASTR websites, the access to archives. Cambridge wants to drive members to use the site, and has introduced better branding to make ASTR's connection to *Theatre Survey* more visible. In addition, *Theatre Survey* can have

special online issues on particular themes. One key feature of the redesign is that now the journal branding is more prominent than Cambridge branding.

- Financial terms: the new contract not only improves the financial return to ASTR, but also lays the foundation for future development. There is increased support for the editorial team, and increased support and structure in place for expanding the number of issues from two to three. CUP wants to work on a strategic development plan as well as an editorial development plan. Increased functionality and access online will improve the links between members, journal, and wider audience.

- Professional External Review: CUP will take the initiative on sending the journal out for external review. It's an exercise that will help identify the strengths and weaknesses of the journal and make concrete whatever perceptions might be 'out there' and allow the journal to define itself more concretely.

Sell inquired about what the CUP might be able to do to help cultivate writers and get more people to submit to *Theatre Survey*. Hoffman noted that the move to three issues will send out a good signal to writers, and also shorten the wait between acceptance and publication. In addition, the more we can encourage members to read on line, the more submissions we'll get. Being able to publish supplementary material will also be attractive to authors. Moreover, CUP can do campaigns to target specific authors—if they do a review, it will give feedback and information as to why certain authors don't submit, and allow us to reach out to them.

Nellhaus asked about authors' rights to their own work. Hoffman replied that Cambridge has a very liberal policy on authors' rights to their own work—authors have right to republish in all forms, immediately. The Cambridge copyright form is implicitly an addendum to this contract. Hoffman promised to send a copy of that form to the EC.

The committee broke for lunch at 12:15, and reconvened at 1:05 pm.

### **13. Report on 2010 conference--Anthea Kraut & Nadine George-Graves**

a) George-Graves noted that the co-chairing experience with Anthea was a very positive experience, and thanked the Vice President for her help with conference organizing. The biggest challenge the organizers faced was the large number of submissions received. They had 180 proposals for plenaries, and 62 working sessions. Given the response to the call, they wanted to accommodate as many people as possible, and have a dialogue that didn't shortchange one organization or the other. This led to some changes in format. They both felt it was important to retain the stand-alone plenary; introducing one session per working session that was more of a traditional panel (the "Concurrent Paper Panels") seemed a good solution that would allow more scholars to present their work and give others an alternative to auditing a working session. This is a structure more familiar to CORD participants, but it was still a logistical/administrative challenge. The top forty plenary proposals were offered a slot somewhere on the program, either as a plenary or as a concurrent paper. They are pleased with the diversity of papers and participants in terms of rank, geography, topic, etc.

Another formatting decision they made was to accommodate more performative presentations (a tradition at CORD). This was tricky, as the rooms in the hotel are not as conducive to allowing performance as the spaces CORD usually uses on university campuses. In addition, the schedule carries on the practice established in San Juan with the inclusion of a local panel. There is also a TLA panel, and the conference ends with a bang with a panel on the Mabou Mines theater company. They are hoping that by scheduling this at the end of the conference it will encourage people to stay. The State of the Profession panel features both dance and theatre scholars. In addition, there are a number of receptions being hosted by journals and presses, and there is the opportunity to attend the Ralph Lemon performance. George-Graves said they are both very happy about the numbers attending, and noted that the conference will not be intimate, and expressed hope that doesn't disappoint. The joint nature of the conference was challenging, there was some resistance from CORD at times to the ASTR format.

Kraut echoed George-Graves appreciation of the assistance provided by Erickson and Wolf. She elaborated on the challenges presented by the joint nature of the conference. ASTR has a unique format; usually, CORD accepts many more proposals, and the need to reject a large number of proposals was difficult for the CORD members on the Program Committee; the large number of rejections was also startling to many CORD members who did not get a place on a plenary or panel, and it was hard to explain to them. In addition, some working session organizers envisioned their sessions as movement sessions/workshops—the structure for proposing a working session was awkward, since the format required individual proposals but these organizers wanted to invite attendees openly to participate. Some of these working sessions have a small list of participants but are hoping to have attendees come and work with them without signing up in advance. There may be a need to communicate this to conference attendees.

#### **14. Theatre Survey Report—Catherine Cole & Leo Cabranes Grant**

Editor Cole inquired about whether or not EC members were getting their copies of *Theatre Survey*—this was a problem last year, one that CUP has been working to address. Some members seem not to have received the latest issue. The President stated that this year the officers decided to extend a grace period to people whose membership has expired but are planning to renew, but it might be prudent to send an email out to the membership to find out who is still not getting the journal. Cole expressed a desire to give the procedures put in place to fix the problem some time to take effect.

Associate Editor Cabranes-Grant thanked Cole for a productive working relationship. The journal is building a template for expansion to three issues, they have found a new Associate Editor, and have in place a new submission system. Cabranes-Grant is ready to jump into the expansion and make *Theatre Survey* a journal that reflects the diversity of our community and our scholarship. He encouraged members of the EC to overwhelm the journal with submissions of their work and encourage their colleagues to do the same.

The President asked Bennett to take up the use of the journal as a way of expanding membership in the website committee work that she will be heading. There may be ways to use the website and/or listserv more proactively to nudge the membership and remind them of renewal deadlines, etc.

Cabranes-Grant noted that CUP is hoping to expand the journal's presence online, which will allow us to stay in touch with potential readers throughout the year. CUP has committed to investing more time, energy, and money in keeping up the visibility of the journal year-round.

The President announced that outgoing editor Cole will move into membership on the Publications Committee, where her experience as editor will be invaluable to the committee's work. The President expressed thanks to Cole for her excellent stewardship of the journal and for her willingness to continue to serve in this new capacity. The President also remarked that perhaps it should be an informal policy in future to invite the outgoing editor to serve on the Publications Committee.

#### **15. American Theatre Archive Project/ Ad hoc Committee on Archive Preservation—Susan Brady**

Brady reported that the ATAP has applied for a grant to support the project, it's currently being reviewed by NEH, and we'll hear whether or not we have won the grant in April. Surveying has already begun: there are over seventy volunteers who are working in local teams to provide information on archival programs in various theatres around the country. Those volunteers who are present at the conference will meet on Friday morning at 7:45 am.

The President noted that, for the future, we may also want to be thinking not only of materials in theatres but also those presently in archives. The sense of urgency for this committee's work comes from hearing of the loss of library staffing at Harvard and at the Lincoln Center, and also from hearing that materials in archives are disintegrating. We're losing important materials, and at the same time losing support for archive preservation and access.

Brady remarked that libraries can't afford to be proactive to go into theatres, and theatres don't have the resources to archive their materials on their own, they're busy making theatre, not archives. Ybarra stated that in her own research she has come across theatres that are in crisis, where the materials aren't accessible for financial and/or material reasons. Brady emphasized that it would be helpful if the ATAP were alerted to those materials that are in urgent need of saving and processing. The project is to train the trainers, so that eventually students can be taught how to do this work. When the resources are there, they'll know where to start.

The President announced that there is also an NEA grant application in the works.

Richards inquired as to whether or not the ATAP was reaching out to "ethnic" theatres. Brady responded that they are starting to get information from the teams, but that they

can't approach theatre companies now, because they don't have money, but when the funding comes through the plan is to survey those companies, find out who has archives, where they are, etc. At that point the ATAP will have a sense of what's going on and can get back to them with a plan for preserving materials.

The President noted that archive preservation is fundamental to the work of the society.

Brady suggested that the ATAP should be changed from an ad hoc committee to a standing committee. The President stated a desire to take up the question either at the February meeting or as an electronic discussion and vote. The President expressed thanks to Susan Brady and the Ad hoc Committee on Archive Preservation for their work on this important project.

#### **16. Discussion of Issues Arising from the "Membership Assessment Survey" and the "Report on New Paradigms in Graduate Education"**

The rest of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of issues arising from the work of the membership assessment committee and the committee on New Paradigms in Graduate Education. The President directed the Secretary not to record the conversation, but take note of any ideas that came out of the discussion that the EC might want to follow up on or on which action might need to be taken. These items follow as bullet points:

##### *Apropos the Membership Assessment Survey:*

- The President directed Bennett to take up consideration of the use of the listserv, the relationship of the listserv to ASTR, and the use of the website to enhance communications between the leadership and the membership, and among the membership itself, as part of the committee work on the website.

- It was noted that if we put the survey online and make it available to the membership, we should be careful to remove information that would make respondents identifiable to readers.

##### *Apropos the Report on New Paradigms in Graduate Education:*

- EC members expressed a desire to follow up on the idea of a survey of working conditions for 'recent' PhD's (e.g., 2, 3, 5, perhaps 10 years out) to get a better sense of what we are preparing our PhD students to do.

- Several members stressed the importance of internal advocacy for the value of humanities and/or arts research, teaching, and learning—that is, to not accept the narrative imposed on us from the outside. We need to speak from a position of strength if we want to take our programs to the next step. Communicating the value of a program internally to a given institution is part of the project; ASTR may have a role to play in helping programs craft such narratives and speak from a position of strength.

•Nathans asked for action steps; the EC agreed we're not ready for those yet. There is still a need to sort through the conversation; perhaps a proposal might be brought to the February meeting. Any financial proposals should be discussed with the Treasurer in the interim.

**17. New business**

- a) The Spring meeting will be held in Dallas, TX, February 25-27, 2011.
  
- b) The President and EC expressed thanks to outgoing EC members Brandi Catanese, Daphne Lei, Ramon Rivera-Servera, Rebecca Schneider, and GSC Representative Charlotte McIvor.

**18. Adjournment**

**MOTION:** to adjourn. Moved by Nellhaus, second by Chansky. **Carried by acclamation.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Arons  
Secretary

RECORD OF EVOTES TAKEN DEC 2010 – FEB 2011

1) MOTION: The ASTR Best Essay Prize shall be renamed the Oscar G. Brockett Best Essay Prize. The Dissertation Research Fellowships shall be renamed the Helen Krich Chinoy Dissertation Research Fellowships. For the time being, all dissertation fellowships will be named after Chinoy, with the understanding that future ECs can, if they choose, name a single fellowship after her and others after honorees to come. Moved by Blair, seconded by Nellhaus. Voting conducted between 6 December 2010 and 9 December 2010. 16 yes.

2) MOTION: All ASTR members in good standing at the end of the membership year (August 31st) shall continue to receive the benefits of membership through the end of the calendar year, including access to members-only areas of the website and issues of Theatre Survey. Moved by Nellhaus, seconded Wolf. Voting conducted between 23 December 2010 and 26 December 2010. 15 yes.

3) MOTION: to ratify Shelley Orr as candidate for Treasurer on the Election Slate. Moved by Blair, seconded Arons. Voting conducted between 23 January 2011 and 26 January 2011. 17 yes.