

ASTR American Society for Theatre Research

Minutes of the Fall 2014 ASTR Executive Committee Meeting Mariott Baltimore Waterfront Hotel 20 November 2014

Present: Patrick Anderson (Vice President for Conferences), Robin Bernstein, Cynthia Brizzell-Bates (Treasurer), Marla Carlson (Secretary), Joshua Chambers-Letson, Catherine Cole (Vice President for Publications), Soyica Colbert, Amy Cook (Secretary elect), Michelle Cowin-Mensah (GSC Representative), Nancy Erickson (Administrator, *ex officio*), Koritha Mitchell, Heather Nathans (President), Kirsten Pullen, Analola Santana, Jill Stevenson, Adam Versényi, Shane Vogel, E.J. Westlake, Leigh Woods. Andy Shelp, Eric Ewald, Erin __, Carol Martin

Absent: Suk-Young Kim.

The President called the meeting to order at 8:06 a.m.

Introductions were made. There were 17 voting members present, including the President as Committee Chair.

1. Adoption of the agenda.

MOTION: To adopt the agenda prepared by the President for the Fall 2014 Meeting. Moved by JS, seconded by KP. Vote: yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried unanimously.**

2. Approval of the consent agenda.

The consent agenda includes the following items, available for review online prior to the meeting:

- Spring 2014 EC minutes with addendum recording conference call meetings
- Approval of Nicholas Ridout as Associate Editor, *Theatre Survey*:
- Committee members and appointments

MOTION: To approve the consent agenda prepared by the President for the Fall 2014 Meeting. Moved by AV, seconded by LW. Vote: 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried unanimously.**

3. President's report (Heather Nathans)

Welcome to all the new people. Amy, Cindy re-elected, Koritha, Carol
Outgoing Marla, Dorothy, Soyica, Suk-Young, Kirsten, Leight, Michelle
Welcome Ewald.

Updates on task forces, new management company, TLA collaboration.

4. Report of Vice President for Conferences (Patrick Anderson)

Meeting with conf comm on Saturday; would welcome input. Hope to develop guidelines to send out after this conference, including a deadline for.

Portland 2015, Minneapolis 2016, the 2017 conference will be held in Atlanta.

Meeting with a couple people about Minneapolis, solicits further interest. If people mention interest, please put them in contact with PA.

Disc: RB is a friend of mayor of Minneapolis.

5. Report of Vice President for Publications (Catherine Cole)

Underscore how well the journal is doing financially, with number of submissions, . Income to ASTR \$30,000, a 53% increase.

Adding two people to the Pubs Comm, would welcome suggestions. Should be people who have edited a journal. This is the pool from which future VPs of Pubs are drawn.

6. Treasurer's report (Cynthia Brizzell-Bates)

a. Update on current budget status

In really good financial situation. We should keep this in mind as we discuss projects. We don't have much space in our budget so perhaps need to rethink the budget structure. Investments have not done as well this year as they have in the two previous year. Thinks the increased withdrawal that we agreed upon is okay for now. Inv adviser says to stay the course. We should keep an eye on it between now and March. HN asked what "rethink" means—recalibrate within? or add more money? CBB says "both." Structure of awards money is very confusing—this money comes from the amount we withdraw from our investments. So look at the structure of them. See whether there are any awards that have come and gone in terms of their popularity. One this year was not used (no applicants) and some have very few.

a. Potential funding source

HN notes that we got an email from the Hoosie-Martin foundation. Offers grants and grant-funding training to organizations. We are still eligible even though our manager is no longer in Colorado, because we have members there. First deadline is 24 November. Want to make sure that people can continue to attend and participate in our conferences. This would serve the contingent labor force and graduate students.

MOTION: to initiate a grant application to the Hoosie-Martin Foundation. Moved by EJW move, seconded by JS. unanimous.

C. TLA/ASTR funding request for Digital Scholarship Award

New collaboration discussed the need to recognize the work being done in digital scholarship. Plan to invite ATHE to join this collaboration. Assumed that the field will have changed significantly by 2020.

Motion In the interest of recognizing excellence in the growing field of digitally-based scholarship and research, ASTR and TLA propose the creation of a ~~joint~~ awards in Digital Scholarship to be designed and administered by a joint ASTR/TLA *ad hoc* committee, appointed by the presidents of each organization. The awards would be launched in 2015. Each organization would contribute \$250 to the awards on an annual basis. The number of awards is at the committees' discretion. The awards' parameters would be reviewed in 2020. Moved by JS, seconded by KP. *Discussion: Strategically, why are people not applying for certain awards, and*

how do we make sure that any new award serve a significant number of members. Noted that this award would hit the popular moment. Some of the titling for awards is vague. The ones that we have tried to increase applicatiосn for have increased. Collaborative award onerous, VISA problem and also two department chair letters—lots of requirement for small amount of money. General letters of recommendation would be much easier. Another alternative would be a form that the chair could fill out; agreed that would be useful. (JCL had good feedback here—Brandi should talk with him.) Jill says to think carefully about SV and CM have been working on the targeted, Brooks, research; three letters for up to \$3000; suggests one letter rather than three. EJ says one of these requires the three to come from active ASTR members. Felt that the 5-page application was sufficient, didn't need the extra materials. Maybe combine targeted and research or just have 2 research grants. HN says maybe rethink the targeted categories but doesn't want to lose sight of the value of offering awards in areas where there is not a lot of scholarship. Kirsten notes that 2012 is the year held up as great year for awards. We had enormous push from EC and from Conf Comm to tell people to apply. CC notes important of marketing extrnally such as to African tehatre organization located in the UK (where she has never seen any info) RB thinks that the Digital award could get a good number of applicants but that the money is not the most significant think; it's about validating digital scholarship. If ATHE gets on board, why not have them give up to three awards. More awards with less money makes more sense in this case. PA was going to say something similar. Conveys explicit message to departments that are reviewing digital scholarship. Shows that prof orgs endorse this work. We're going to need to support members for things they really need to do. One is subvention. Univ presses are pushing universities to provide subvention. That amount probably needs to increase. Jill reinforces Shane's point that we need to keep the application requirements very low, because people won't have time to do that work for a small amount of money. Ask the awards committees what they need to see in order to choose a winner. Carol asks for clarification, this is for digitally born scholarship. HN notes that we would ask the committee to define the parameters. Perhaps journals that are digital only would not count—if users interact with the material the same way as they do with print. HN suggests having Treasurer total the amount of money that we distribute in awards and use this in a marketing effort: ASTR gives out \$25,000 a year in awards. Make sure you apply for some.

Friendly amendment: pa to approve; KP second

Vote: yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried unanimously.**

7. Secretary's report (Marla Carlson)

a. The general membership now has access to all of the reports on the Leadership page, which were formerly available only to the officers and members of the Executive Committee. There has been no progress in setting up online report submission, but the current Secretary doesn't consider that a high priority.

random google search on Heather's name would not turn up a report as a result

b. There has been no progress in planned Conference Program archive on the ASTR website ha. The Administrator offered to provide PDF files for the last ten years' programs, and we can request materials prior to that from the Archives at the University of Maryland.

c. EC members and officers were urged to both consult the Handbook and to provide updates to the information that it contains.

8. Administrator's report (Nancy Erickson)

Report in hard copy. 530 full conf reg.

990 tax filing has been completed. Will file it electronically in Colorado.

Probably will make our goal for 740 members; now at 715. Membership process is now all completed online. Fewer than 20 people have registered since the badges were printed last week; this is a positive logistical development—less financial work after the conference.

HN asks why there's been such a big leap in membership since 2012. NE says it's our general awesomeness. Policies are working; also note that 530 of the 715 members are attending this year's conference, which is an excellent result. ATHE is losing members. Could look at data from previous years if we wanted to know more (such as whether people are choosing one over the other.) EJ wonders about demographic shifts. Shaun got a sense from the grad students last year that they had a different impression of ASTR than we did as graduate students—it's a more welcoming organization. PA sees a challenge: we offer the small conference feel, and it's hard to maintain this as we grow. The conference structure is important (with working groups). KP notes the importance of the conference no longer seeming to be a closed shop. Number of working sessions is more than double what it was in 1999 when she joined.

NE notes Drop-off in number of mentor/mentee, from 111 in 2012, to 99 in 2013, and now only 69. This is not necessarily negative: could be that people are more comfortable with the organization. New members have found senior scholars to be accessible and feel less need. MCM notes that the drop-off is less than reported here—we now have 90. Dip in membership for GSC, which could be affecting the number of mentees. NE notes that the GSC took over the matching last year, and this has been great. The grad students do the investigation of areas of interest.

Koritha notes that comments noted how long the relationships lasted, thought that was very good.

NE notes that the number of exhibitors and advertises have remained stagnant. This is an area that could use a marketing push.

One sponsor: U Toronto Press and *Modern Drama* are helping to fund the opening reception. PA notes that re the Northwestern and CUP reception honoring *Theatre Survey*: Ewald will help us develop policies about this; there was no communication with either the Administrator, the Program chair, or the officers (Heather and Patrick).

Spring meeting 27-29 March 2015. will be handled by Ewald.

a. Transition process review. Lots of phone calls and conference calls over the past month, hoping this effort will help Ewald get up to speed. Thanks the 3 Ewald people for being present for today's meeting. Andy becomes Administrator on 1 Dec and NE stops working for us 31 Dec.

9. Report of the Graduate Student Caucus (Michelle Cowan-Mensah)

In past, GSC hasn't been as healthy structurally as it could have been. Solid foundation has developed over the past few years. Thanks David Calder and Kellyn Johnson. Michelle has focused on visibility—create more events, repeated events from past years, big increase in FB

and Twitter feed. Still, a decrease in members. The GSC is asking them to be involved but could do a better job in marketing what ASTR does for future scholars. Jill asks for numbers of graduate students involved in working sessions—this could be useful in encouraging graduate students to attend and for them to feel involved. Pres suggests a letter from the Pres congratulating the number of students who participated in various ways. CC suggests marketing specifically pitched to first-year graduate students; a communication to DGSs. HN notes another org for which membership officer sent a personal letter to new grad students inviting them to join. RB suggests a brown-bag session geared to pre-dissertation graduate students, offers to work with GSC to organize that for next year. Will contact the career session organizers with this idea.

HN asks what the GSC is using the FB and twitter platforms to do. MCM notes that they send out CFPs.

Virtual Book Club didn't really take off. Thinks that a set date for posting would work better. Thinks that the career session at the conference will be more effective. There was a good number of people signed up, but little posting. CBB notes with the Kindelan book group, they set up conference calls. Synchronous communication worked better than asynchronous. Met at both ATHE and ASTR.

Jill offered feedback of mentor/mentee process: asks for more lead time in making connection with mentees.

MCM notes that the number of people who dropped out of mentorship program was staggering. Mostly mentors. Only people who filled out the google survey were matched; those who didn't were dropped. PA suggests undoing some of the detail in the preparatory work—the complications seem to come from heightened expectations prior to the conference. Something in between the two options (nothing and so much). The survey asked for a two-day turnaround. Pres noted that the letter about mentoring was useful in establishing parameters. About expectations: MCM will distribute a survey about this process at the breakfast. Pres asks GSC to work with Ewald about the timing of communications.

Notes the GSC's active tweeting program. They discussed but rejected the Instagram option. NE notes importance of remembering that anything that engages our web presence must happen in consultation with both the President and the Communications Manager.

Notes that they discussed the shortcomings of having a one-year presidency but also the difficulty of asking graduate students to commit to a multi-year position. CC suggests have a president-elect. Koritha notes that the GSC twitter account re-tweeted something that she tweeted about an MLA mentoring program. Patrick notes that other organizations do have multi-year terms for graduate student offices.

10. Report on 2013 Conference (Margaret Werry)

Thanks for opportunity.

To what extent is the org committed to have practice and performance presented here? Do we want to formalize this in some year. Project in Dallas was a tremendous amount of work. Scaled back this year to fit into a working session format. Clear that there is absolutely no production support. Should this be an office?

Online submissions for plenary and working session proposals was efficient. The working groups did not use this process, and there were large numbers of people applying to more than one working session. The highest number was four. Worked hard to balance the sessions. Had conveners forward rejected proposals, and they re-placed 15-20 applications in this manner. Suggests have abstract submission to working sessions go through the ASTR portal with the option to select a second choice session. Patrick thinks it's a great suggestion that will ruffle some feathers—centralizing the applications will make it more difficult to run little mini-conferences. Democratize the process. Who to talk to? Shaun will be working with Ewald through May 31, so they'll address this together. KP voices very strong support for this. Thinks we should reject people for double dipping. It was 20+ people this year. Cindy voices support for this idea. Notes that people can't get funding if they don't have a proposal accepted. MCM thinks that many of the grad students are not aware of this. GSC needs to make that general announcement. RB notes that a computer system will make this impossible and is the only way to solve the problem. Patrick notes that this removes the need for punishment. This is the single biggest headache for a conference planner outside of doing the work that you're supposed to do. MOTION: to charge Shaun and Ewald to research and implement a submission system, fully accessible, for submissions to accepted working sessions hopefully 1 May 2015. move PA, second RB. Disc: unanimous.

Catherine thinks that this is larger than the conference organization. Happens for journals too. Generational change: students are submitted 18-20 college applications. Having the options to choose second and third choice will help meet the demand for bet hedging without creating difficulties.

Conf Comm is talking about PerformASTR and hopes to have suggested policies for discussion at the Spring 2015 EC meeting. Will build in some support for the conf planner. Would like to include Margaret and Brian in those conversations. Adam notes that the way Brian ran the program this year made room for people who are both scholars and practitioners; opened this up for the presentation of practice as research. NE suggests that plans look at this initiative from the conference perspective, so that it's not just from the program chair's perspective. Adding a session a day creates problems from the contracting side: may not be able to get an additional room. Jill asks where does this responsibility sit: Conf comm or Program chair. Patrick reminds us that this started only three years ago. Responds to a desire and demand within the organization.

11. ATAP Report

Doing an extraordinary job, raising money, doing outreach.

12. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Membership (Soyica Diggs-Colbert)

Updates on Membership Survey

Thanks to Josh and Michelle and other members of the committee. Also the heads of other ad hoc committees who provided questions. Highlights: assumed that the majority of respondents would be grad students and assistant profs, but there was an even distribution across ranks. Suggests that we're doing mentorship well, and the membership wants more funding in terms of grants and awards. People see ASTR as a space to share their scholarship. Two thirds of membership have participated in Career Sessions. One third make income between \$20-50,000.

Notes that her term is ending, and the committee will continue to work with the complete report and submit recommendations by January. They need a new chair. The response rate (25.7%) is quite good. Andy notes that most organizations except 8-10%. Pres says that the previous survey in 2009 had a 33% response rate. We have done micro-surveys in the interim. Patrick wondered how the data was aggregated: could we find out the correlation between rank and the 33% of respondents who do not find the cost-value relation positive. This intersectional data would help us in making decisions about how to structure fellowships. Pres notes that the comments about conference structures and themes will be useful to the Conf Comm. NE notes that we need to think carefully about what we want to communicate to the membership about this data. Some will be valuable to specific committees but not always to the membership as a whole. Andy notes that the best surveys happen on a regular basis (annually) so that we can see change over time. A one-time survey really gives anecdotal data. Adam wonders if there might be a way at registration for members to contribute an additional amount to help subsidize conference attendance. NE notes that there is an option on registration form to contribute to scholarships. NE notes that we're giving two Keller and two Marshall awards, and we're budgeted for three. Secy noted that there were 14 applications for the Marshall and 4 for the Keller. CBB notes that we need to make efforts to get people to maintain their membership even if they can't attend the conference in a given year. Pres notes there must be a value to the membership beyond the conference. Soyica notes that a significant number of respondents identified *Theatre Survey* as a benefit.

Highest response of reason is 84% for sharing scholarship. But more than 50% saw ASTR as an official arbiter of scholarship. PA would like this data aggregated with rank as well. Pres asks for a somewhat deeper report on the data for the membership.

13. Report of Task Force on Collaborations (EJ Westlake)

a. Quiet year. Suk-Young worked with Henry. They generated some questions for the survey. Queried the liaisons and got one reply: "I would love to know more about what I am supposed to be doing." EJ and Pres will communicate more fully about this. Suggestion of a conference call with the liaisons.

b. ASTR/ATHE NEH Summer institute (prepared by Suk-Young Kim; presented by Robin Bernstein)

Admin notes that ATHE happens at end of July or very start of August.

Themes: digital scholarship, pedagogy. Suk-Young really wants feedback on these themes but also suggestions for additional themes. Carol notes that she had an NEH seminar early in her career that continues to inform her scholarship. Kristin appreciates aiming for people more advanced in their careers. Patrick suggests that she may want to solicit feedback on logistics,

such as location: needs to be decided fairly early in the process. Various universities might be engaged in initiatives that would intersect with a selected theme and wish to host the institute. Pres notes that we need to identify a new chair for this initiative. Also that these applications are often not funded on the first attempt but get suggestions for improving the proposal.

14. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Mentorship (Robin Bernstein and Michelle Cowan-Mensah)

Robin: big picture is that state of mentorship is excellent. Task force main goal should be to support continued strength rather than creating new structures. Group would like to have an offsite event at the next ASTR, and now has new evidence to help her push back against this desire. Also need to make sure that they support the GSC's initiatives rather than encroaching upon them.

Each member of the committee is talking to three different people at the conference; partly to gather data but also to keep the conversation going in a viral manner.

Michelle: people need to know about what we're doing.

Pres notes the need to continue mentoring people after graduate school, particularly if they're employed in contingent positions or outside the academy. Jill suggest focusing on the mentors: how to mentor people at lower ranks or outside the academy. Adam has a valuable model from UNC. Patrick suggests thinking about what mentoring is—can also mentor up. Need for help relates to role as well as rank. Catherine seconds this and suggests that we articulate in terms of communities of practice and think of this as playing it forward. Carol suggests that we can bring people together for conversations about issues without identifying a lack; for example, about clarifying guidelines for promotion and tenure. Andy suggests approaching it from a lifelong learning perspective. Marla noted session this year on useful peer view for book manuscripts; suggests also on journal editing. Kirsten suggests career sessions on administration and DGSs.

Michelle notes that she is ending her term as GSC President and will speak to the president-elect about the possibility of stepping into the co-chair position for this committee.

15. Report of Task Force on Working Conditions (Jill Stevenson)

Questions for survey; page on Initiatives page of ASTR website with a Wordl and description of some of the task force's work. This years "Tell Me" question is: Tell me what's working. Means both what work entails and what things work. The questions came from the Kindelan conversations and information gathered from last year's conference initiative. The task force includes ten members across the ranks, nine of whom are present at this year's conference. Jill is the only current EC member and stresses the crucial need to have another EC member join and be prepared to continue next year.

16. Next Steps for Task Forces and Ad Hoc Committees

Pres reviewed the summary she provided, identifying the ways in which we have met goals defined in the Spring 2014 EC meeting. Asked us to identify priorities on the to do/on going.

Shane suggests that we **identify what we want liaisons are doing**. This has to happen before we contact them. Remove first three items on the list; instead, this task force will develop parameters for the liaisons to present at the spring EC meeting.

Volunteers to **revise ATHE white paper** on “Scholarship & the Discipline of Theatre.”

Report on Membership Survey.

Three **Finance Committee items** grouped together; Brandi needs to be part of the fellowship discussion, at the least

Noted that PSi is providing administrative and financial support for regional meet-ups and that we might be wise to wait for feedback from the liaison to that organization. Shane suggests bracketing these three and gathering contingent faculty pay under the rubric “Conference Accessibility.” CBB says we need to look at ways to invite people who cannot be physically present at the conference use technology to join in.

Patrick thinks that the data on contingent faculty pay is very important but not exclusively with respect to the conference. This data is sensitive and is not publicly available, so it will be difficult to gather. Suggests moving beyond ad hoc committee model for this, because people who have chaired a department or program would have best access to this information. President says that it might be most effective for her to reach out personally to chairs. Reason for attaching this to conference finances is that it’s needed to develop a sliding scale. Patrick notes that having current chairs in the room, having a conversation about this issue, might lead to effective advocacy. Catherine notes that this is not only about money but also about how to build an inclusive system with respect to professional development and other aspects. **Contingent faculty working conditions** including outreach to ATHE (leadership institute).

New Paradigms report on the state of graduate education.

17. Report by *Theatre Survey Editor* (Esther Kim Lee)

No major issues. Harvey has taken over and already edited his first issue. One major task accomplished was to revise the Handbook so that it matched actual practices. One remaining piece of related work is to fine-tune the balance of work between the editor and associate editor and to have the compensation accurately reflect this labor. One goal was to expand the scope of this journal both to reach an international audience and to diversify the topics. The collaboration with Theatre Research International was entirely positive and she feels raised the profile of the journal. Soyica reported not only that members reported *Theatre Journal* as second in value only to the conference but also that they showed no preference over reading it online as opposed to in print. Patrick asked what she wished the membership knew, and Esther feels that the submission guidelines are quite clear and she had no problems. The one difficulty is in soliciting and receiving peer reviews. The journal cannot function without them. That would be the main message. Jill noted that we discussed this issue last year, and it was suggested that the editors use the editorial board more not only to review but also to suggest other reviewers. Esther replied that they do in fact use the board in this way, but response differs from one individual to another.

Esther says that she learned the importance of being personal in her email engagement with reviewers (rather than relying upon the automatic communications from ScholarOne).

18. Report by Cambridge University Press (Holly Buttimore)

Notes that she's available for conversation at the exhibitor's booth and her report gives her email address. Appreciates the excellent work being done by Esther and Harvey. Circulation 2882 institutions, up one third over the last two years. For the first time, more international usage. Notes the chart on pages 15-16 of her report. This broadens not only circulation but the scope of submissions. 97% of subscribers either have an online element or are online only.

Cambridge has its own online platform. Most other publishers work with Highwire. They have releases of new software three times a year. Alt-metric provides citation analysis, measures use of an article including social media. Over 17,000 downloads a year. Joint issue had 1564 views in the first month since publication. The journal publishes on time and within its page budget.

British colleagues are hearing a lot from their institutions about complying with open access. The basic requirement is for authors to share their accepted manuscripts with their institutional repository. Royalty up from \$19,000 last year to \$30,000 this year.

Patrick says that UC requires its authors to make everything they publish open access, but this can happen through the university repository. Holly says that there are different models for open access, and CUP publishes across the spectrum. How we choose to make our content available is up to the Society. Question raised about open-access platforms such as Select Works and Academia.edu. Catherine suggests that author rights would be a good topic for a Career Session. It was also noted that we might educate the membership about the issues involved in how they share their own scholarship and that of other scholars.

19. Report of the Awards and Fellowships Committee (Dorothy Chansky)

Questions for our consideration: Do we still need both research grants? Should some awards (such as the Hewitt) be restricted to ASTR members? Catherine wonders whether publishers are unwilling to part with the complimentary copies. Dorothy doesn't think so, but other people say from personal knowledge that is the case. Patrick notes that academic presses are really scrambling for what to do. He wonders whether ASTR can buy books or somehow meet presses halfway. Jill speaks of successful experience in asking for one copy and circulating them among the committee members. Josh notes that presses might be willing to distribute electronic copies. Robin notes that some presses will ask the author to choose three awards. Shane recaps our earlier discussion of the structure of awards. [Brandi arrived at 1:15.] One Keller application was ineligible. Dorothy thinks that one reason for the spike in applications in 2012 was the breakdown of categories on the website. Another was Iris's efforts.

20. Plans for 2015 Conference (Janelle Reinelt and James Harding)

Seems that there are more working sessions than ever seen before, and the size of the groups has gradually escalated. They are considering pulling back the numbers for the unique working sessions but leaving the research groups to do as they wish. Patrick speaks in favor of this, so that the sessions prioritize the work of the group over the conference, and that they carefully consider their relation to the conference. Clarified that the growth has not been a matter of policy

but of “creep.” Question was raised what cap they would consider reasonable and how would this affect conference attendance. James notes based upon experience over twenty years that the experience becomes unmanageable for participants when the groups get larger.

Noted that working session conveners are supposed to have the freedom to imagine the structure and size of the session that they propose. Janelle notes that there was a **document describing all of this** and also including an assessment process, but this is no longer available on the website. Patrick suggests changing the proposal format; instead, describe exactly what you would like the session to do, and how many people you would like to participate. The program committee can then respond to the proposals and perhaps suggest revised caps. The implicit guarantee for continuing groups has led to proposals with very little information. Suggests asking these groups to articulate what they are doing and how many people should participate. J&J note that it is too late to change the language, because the call for papers is already distributed. They will implement these suggestions with a soft touch and make recommendations for next time.

JJJ wonder about interaction with website and about timelines. Conversation about PerformASTR will continue; they have been discussion how they can configure it differently for a stronger connection to the scholarship. Kellen Hoxworth came in after lunch.

15. Adjournment

MOTION: To adjourn. **The motion passed unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 1:53 p.m.

ADDENDUM 1 TO THE MINUTES