American Society for Theatre Research

Executive Committee Meeting Agenda
November 3, 2016
Minnesota Room

(In case of emergency, call Amy Cook 858-336-1418)

7:30 a.m.  Continental breakfast served
In attendance: Adrienne Macki, Debra Caplan, Jasmine, Stephanie Vella, Carol Martin, Catherine Cole, Daphne, Chyrstyna Dail, Cindy Bates, Jill Stevenson, Adam Versenyi, Noe Montez, Josh Chambers-Letson, Brandi Wilkins-Catanese, Analola Santana, Jimmy Noriega

8:06 a.m.  Call to order
a. Approval of agenda
b. Approval of Meeting notes from Spring EC Meeting and September conference call
   Debra moved and Jill seconded. Approved.
c. Introductions of any new faces in the room
   Kris Haskin, Yasmine Jahanmir

8:10-8:20  President’s report (Lei)
a. Committee for hiring & evaluating the ASTR administrator
   Time sensitive work to be done yearly in February. Renewal is really quick after next year’s conference. Contract expires end of May. One review this year. Then basis for next year’s review.

   Going forward: digitization. Updated the website. Need a serious conversation about this. Need to build an online community so ASTR is happening all year. And as an archive. Also need to get the sponsorship committee moving. Also need to apply for bigger grants. Unless we want to increase fees each year. Re-start the Mentorship committee.

8:20-8:30  Secretary’s report (Cook)
   a. Spring meeting scheduled
   b. Liaisons and reports
   c. Committee needs?
d. Ad-hoc committees will be writing sections for the Handbook (general guidelines. Guidelines for reports. What you have done, goals, how will you know if you’ve succeeded, when will you sunset?) Evaluate the importance of the committee?

e. What we expect of liaisons? What are their charges? What do we need to know? What can we do to strengthen this relationship?

8:30-8:40  VP for Awards report (Wilkins Catanese)

a. Edited volume award
b. Awards spending
c. Timing of publicity

- All is well. Awards are being received. Thanks to Kris to coordinate the Powerpoint for ceremony. Reduced the number of plaques. Added paper certificates for people who didn’t get them before. Sharp increase in the number of applications for travel award.
- **Should we think about increase the amount of funding or awards in this category?** In at least in one instance, it made the difference in going or not going—The award is doing what it’s suppose to do. Alerting the membership to upcoming deadlines
- **Publicizing early**—Oct 1st for publication of award winners but: **Saving the element of surprise for Distinguished scholar award.**
  - Daphne: it should be before early registration deadline
  - Brandi: let’s shoot for Sept. 15th. Then it gives people more time.
  - Jill: is there a set away in which people are denied?
  - Brandi: for research and travel fellowship awards, there should be an email. I will make sure that those emails go out. For articles and stuff, no.

Questions for discussions: should we recognize essays in Banes and Hill categories?

Currently it says: “In extraordinary circumstances…”

- Brandi: it seemed unfair to essay submissions to put them in the same category as a book. We can give them a citation without expecting them to compete with a book-length form. Huge number of submissions, some essay, some books, if an essay is terrific, but not as great as a book, it would be nice to have a way of recognizing them.
- Adam: what’s percentage of each?
- Brandi: Hill, not so many. Banes, quite a few.
- Adam: does it make sense to separate them. An award in both categories.
- Brandi: we discussed that last spring
- Adam; if you are just giving a citation, it has huge value for the person receiving the award. Removes the question of evaluation?
- Chyrstyna: opens up the field to those not working in a job that can do a book.
- Carol: is there a way to word it in a positive way?
- Adrienne: adding the language about having a citation would increase the number of submissions. Might generate more submissions. To encourage and cultivate other areas.

- Prize for editing? We discussed this, discussed the many questions that came up around it—Do we have the man power? Is there any more focused understanding of what we want to recognize? Is there any ways in which we want to tighten down the pool? Play anthology? Previously published? Edited journals? Reader? Just scholarly research?—and then tabled it.
- Does the EC want to take a stand on multiple winners of awards?
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8:40-8:50   **Membership Committee** (Montez)

   a. Tell me booth-- restructuring the questions to rethink who is engaging with astr now
      and during the rest of the year
   b. Member demographic survey
      once we get that information, how can we best interpret it to serve the needs of ASTR.
      Daphne: I want this to be a part of registration or membership renewal.

If we only get 1/3, we don’t know demographics. Next year it should be part of the registration,
before confirmation.

Can we extend the tell me booth stuff beyond the conf if people want to contribute but aren’t here?

8:50-9:00   **Admin. Report** (Ewald)

   • Tax return prepared for Cindy’s signature
   • Updated annual business filing. Liability insurance is up to date.
   • Membership renewal process was more successful than last year. New staffer and he/she is
     bringing more structure which is resulting in more renewals. Did sweep back to people who
     haven’t renewed in years. They are still coming in. Will hit budget this year. Number of
     membership, based on revenue: mid 60k range. The numbers starting to increase nicely.
     Emily provided a number of updates that she’s been working on.
   • Emily moving on to work for another company. One of the realities we face running a
     company: our turnover is low, but we are sorry to see her go. Mohammed will be taking over.
     He’s already started full time. Has been working with Emily. We are going to go up another
     ½ time equivalent. Hiring another full timer. In addition to the increased staff, we have 11-12
     in St. Paul. Taking things off of Mohammed’s plate so he can get up to speed. Not just about
     cranking things out but about the audience and how they like it.
   • Membership meeting and awards program needs to end at 2. Quick turnaround
   • **As meeting starts to wrap up: pass out conflict of interest policy statement.**

9:00-9:15   **Treasurer’s Report** (Bates)

   a. Fundraising for Muñoz
   b. Handbook updates
   c. Budget requests

In a lot better shape this year than we were last year. We’ve regained what we’ve lost, moving
forward positively in terms of our investments. I need to do a little tweaking in terms of our
stocks.

   • Fundraising for Munoz. Probably a two-tier process: small donations and grants.
   • Mid October: $915! Where should that money go? Having the impetus was a reason to
donate.
   • Jill and I are working in terms of how conference planners know how to spend their money.
     How and when to distribute money. Need to know that procedure.
   • Around the Munoz initiative: 3 years? Sunset clause? We need some documentation that we
     all agree to so we know what the charge, the length of time, etc.
• Catherine: what is the goal and how will we know if we are successful? This is threshold questions before approaching Mellon?
• Jill: if we are not meeting goals, how will we adjust?
• Catherine: if we are successful, we might not need to go forward into perpetuity. Maybe there’s a capstone to the project that we go to Mellon for money. Culture shift, expectations.
• Jimmy: we haven’t had the first working session. May need time to let them educate us.
• Josh: the first one starts now, track and assess in 2-3 years. 2018?
• Jill: Sketching out a time line. Clear about the goals going in, even if we assess. If we are going to ask for big gives, we need this info.
• Catherine: small ad hoc group that tracks, to steward forward.
• Cindy: whatever: we will fund this. Need a mandate to fund it. We do not have a vote?
• **Was that document agreed to? Said amount but didn’t say where the money was coming from.**
• Budget requests for next year are due by Feb. 1st!! Sticking with this.

**9:15-9:30  VP for Conferences report (Stevenson)**

a. 2018 conference  
b. Tech Support & Digitization  
c. Conf. planners at spring meeting/re-con  
d. Conf planning deadlines

• Need to formally approve proposal for next year. We have a process in place whereby we accept new proposals. This has gone through revisions already.
• EC reading 2018 Conf. proposal. Concerns were raised and notes given about ways to adjust the proposal.
• Jimmy: how we are advertising this and who is proposing. All conf. planners are white? Why are we not getting these people into those positions?
• Jill: CoC needs to think about how to market, outreach, try to tap members for proposals. It’s a lot of work. 2 years of a lot of work. Faculty of color, faculty in more marginalized positions, are already taking on a tremendous amount of service.

**How do we loop mentorship into this? How do we put structures in place to advocate and mentor to get people into this process so they feel supported?**

• Josh: tried to democratize the process when we came up with this, right? Democracy is awful. Is there a reason we stopped the cultivation? Maybe the VP should be targeting?
• Jill: yes, how do we have an open process, but also cultivate the people who may want to do it in 2-3 years.
• Catherine: it can be both/and. Should be recruitment, planting seeds.
• Jill made Motion: approve the 2018 conference proposal brought forward by the CoC with the recommendations.
• Cindy Second.
• All Ayes, no nos, no abstention
• Daphne: So moved.

• Need to think about Tech Support in submissions. Online process worked great in many ways. Managing the data was really difficult. ASTR leadership and Ewald to talk through how this was going to happen, expectations, etc. Incredible amount of work that Josh and Jen went through to go through that information. Appreciate Ewald and Josh and Jen and their ability to make it happen.

**Planners: mid year meeting at the hotel?**  
Planners are not incorporated at the midyear meeting maybe they should be. Might want to shift the bylaws and handbook to get the planners to the midyear meeting.
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• Updated and revised the spreadsheet of deadlines. It’s being updated with clearer timeline for expectations for program chairs going forward.

9:30-9:45  Program Committee report (Abrams and Parker-Starbuck)

• Thanks Jill!!!! You read the report. We are very happy about how things came together. Last minute things that crop up. Recommendations that Jill sited are some of our concerns.
• Rhonda/Stacy wolf: bible of conference planning? Not just deadlines, expectations? More context around some of those might be helpful. We wanted to have a lot to do with hotel decisions. Performance required a IOT of work. It’s not what hotels are prepared for and if we could have a site visit. Levels of communication got difficult. Too many cooks and time zones, things took too long. Questions getting answered.
• I don’t know how 1 person can do this? There’s a lot to do.
• Jill: also asking Erin to translate performance speak/academic speak/hotel speak.
• Committee numbers: it’s large. And this can make it difficult to schedule a conference call. Might be worth thinking about decreasing those numbers. Asynchronous communication. Flag up
• Sponsorship: urgent that we are working 2 years ahead. Needs to step outside of CoC and program committee chairs.
• History of budgets, what’s been spent on what.
• Jill: here’s the money, do what you want with it. Good and bad. Want to give freedom but we know that creativity happens within boundaries. Need structures to offer guidance.
• Cindy is a great asset in helping figure things. Need to know what we can expect.
• Jill: we rely too much on historical memory in ASTR. Need to write things down.
• Catherine: Affirm. I see great value to articulate a spectrum. Longitudinal over time. There should be an articulated range of realities.
• Carol: is there a line item point of departure for conference planners?
• Cindy: there is one. What are the nature of the expenditures in relationship to the membership.
• Josh: about AV.
• Jen: submission model worked well. If you put down a second or third choice, you got in. LOT of plenary applications. Hotel model is really difficult. Performance limitations. Cost of food is outrageous. Very limiting to organization.
• Josh: ASA onsite committee: external spaces may be available for performances, etc.
• Adam: local committee
• Jen: programming is very difficult. Getting back and forth from another venue can be very difficult. Costing 400 for Skype? Or $350 to bring in their own projector. Also the labor.
• Jill: first year it was in NY. CUNY and NYU. Range of hotels. Using the space of the university, rather than the hotel. Sometimes it’s cheaper because you are using free student labor. Might this be something we want to try? What do we gain and what do we lose? Is there a hybrid model?
• Josh A: ASA is multitrack in away. Timing is very tricky. Frame communication possibilities.
• Jen: cost is so expensive. Wouldn’t we rather pay the university?
• Josh A: EC should consider an ECO friendly policy. Paper program vs. electronic app.
• Jill: really involved in food. All vegetarian, vegan lunch. Sustainability.
• Carol: very exciting moment: Increase in membership, performances, different initial initiatives… can we have the same number of activities with the same few days available to us.
10-10:15 Break

10:15-10:30 Vice President for Publications Report (Cole)

- **TS Editor** (Nic Ridout)
- **Cambridge UP** (Holly Buttimore)

- Catherine: We’ve had a couple of key strategic initiatives: to connect TS to ASTR, internationalizing, inclusion, disability studies, Harvey is now completing his tenure. Nic stepping in! Nic is first editor from outside the US.
- **Motion**: Marla Schweitzer new assoc. editor with term beginning in Jan 2017. Adam seconded, all ayes, no nos, no abstentions; Daphne: so moved.
- **Erica Lin of CUNY grad center, book review editor for 3 year time, jan 2017. Stephanie seconded. All ayes, no nos, no abstentions. Daphne: so moved.**
- Calls for editors. People are able to assume this position without huge support from their home institutions. Some people might have grad assistance, teaching relief, some money from Cambridge. But these are doable roles, even without home support.
- Nic: delighted to be coming in as editor for *Theatre Survey*. 58.1 Theatre and Marxism is in production. Mid December. New people on the editorial board. Trying to add people from outside from US to editorial board. The production team is incredible. Good copy editor. Come to our reception on Friday at 7:30. If there are things you have thought of, find me and tell me what you think.
- Daphne: Thank Catherine for her time as VP of Publications! Looking forward to welcoming Esther.
  From Cambridge: incredibly happy about the quality. Superb standard. Circulation around 3000 institutions. Financially its doing well. Royalties have been increasing, around $26,000/year. We market the journal a lot and we have a lot of people signed up for content alerts and open rate is huge. Much used journal!
- Catherine: we have 3 TS essays winning awards!!
- Hip hip hooray to Catherine.

10:30-10:40 Graduate Student Caucus Report (Vella)

- Thank you for this past year. Not as many mentors as we would like. We are trying to make it work. We have been able to pair up many mentors with the mentorees. Simplify the procedure? Don’t have as many people this year.
- Cindy: We need to follow up.
- Jill: we need mentors!
- Link to survey may be causing problems. We will do more simple procedure.
- Everything else is going well.
- Jill: The mentorship mostly focuses on grad students? Don’t want to lose that element. Don’t know to ask for it because of how its worded? Is there language on the website that explains what it is? You decide what role you want. **That’s the way we market it but maybe think about opening it up a bit more.**
10:40-10:50 Sponsorship Committee (Daphne)

a. Specific grants
b. Long-term fundraising
c. Conference sponsorship

- Need more. Most of the issues have been touched upon. We started late. There’s a distinction between different kinds of sponsorship opportunities.
- How come you don’t have a book prize for Asian authors? Because no one donated.
- Jill: recommendation: sponsorship and outreach committee. EC meeting in Dec. created meeting. Wrote lots of letters, relationships. Delta airlines discount, sponsorship for opening reception. Unless there’s a committee with president and ownership to accomplish. Can’t be part of conference committee. Erin’s put together this wonderful brochure but we don’t know who to send it to? Need to figure out the contacts. Josh and I tried to do it but it couldn’t be our focus. Thinking about long term. There should be two things. Estab. Committee and the chair. Need to happen now. Tried to connect with the city, mayor’s office, started too late. Idea of a local committee. We have to delineate responsibilities. The jobs are different.
- Catherine: Fundraising in an institutional context. Corporate sponsorship is different, stewardship of individual donors. Then grant writing, etc. But there needs to be a strategic decision about what needs to pay off.
- Jill: Erin told us from the beginning that we weren’t going to get anything. Strategize. WE only have a limited amount of volunteer effort.
- Adam: Any kind of fundraising is the long game. Build relationships over time.
- Jimmy: small organization. Long term goals for us are too small for them maybe. Long term goal of grant but maybe the local thing isn’t going to work. A few dollars off something in Atlanta is that going to pay off? Alternate view: we reached out to a restaurant for a discount. That little stuff can really make an impact.
- Catherine: I have a suspicion with the conversations about long members of ASTR. I think there’s something really untapped there. That would make long-range impact. More senior, more established, that’s within reach and not unsubstantial.

10:50-11 Strategize discussion items

Munoz:

- Discussed formation of committee to select and evaluate proposals as well as one to assess the work and think about fundraising. Josh cycling off. Adrienne Macki and Chrystyna volunteered. Other names brought up: Josh Abrams, Faedra, Anita, John 3 years.
- Josh: the board was going to be doing the oversight of the thing. Should be an ec thing. Break it up, makes more sense. CoC?
- Jill: It’s a bit unwieldy. If we want something really strategic, needs to be a small targeted work.
- Carol: who is ever on the selection committee will have nuanced knowledge which is very much related to assessment. Some kind of relationship between the two.
- Catherine: to have a successful grant, we need to know why it started, what the goals are, need someone on the ground.
- Jill: will need the people who have won the award.
- Adam: I would be willing to work on something like this. Maybe we take John and Faedra, I chair a subcommittee of the 3 of us. As one of the people who wrote the original language.
- Jill: and maybe ask one of the conveners who won this year.
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- Josh: that makes sense. Or one of the three organizers this year. Ask the people.
- Jill: I’m happy to reach out to those 5. What are the goals? Grant writing.
- Adam: goals, assessment, long term timeline. Then take the next step to develop the language.
- Catherine: does the document talk about long-term purpose?
- Josh: “minoritarian knowledge production…”
- Catherine: only thing that isn’t there yet is the organizational goals of ASTR. Our desired changing demographics of the institution, would it just continue on? Is there a new ask? $27k for the 5 years but maybe there’s a new idea that goes to Mellon. For them, something about professional organizations. How do professional organizations transform. Think in those kind of terms.
- Catherine: narrative of institutional change.
- Jill: timeline for review and assess, steward the award and the participants, articulate language the relationship; look for grant opportunities; what do we do at 5 year mark. Outcomes, models.
- Josh: track and assess those first year people.
- Daphne: Ask the individuals to report back.
- Cindy: fundraising? Personal ask will render more money.
- Carol: we wanted this to be fully funded from astr?
- Cindy: no, we said we would fundraise for it and would try to cover. Finance committee on board?
- Brandi: the executive committee is committed to using money to make this work for 5 years. We will allocate
- Cindy: that’s what we agreed upon.
- **Motion:** With or without extramural support, the executive committee is committed to using ASTR money within its budget to make the Munoz Working group solvent for 5 years. We will allocate 3K in year one, 6K in year two, 9K in year three, 6k for year 4, 3k in year 5, for a total of $27K over five years. In the event that grants or targeted funding comes in, the burden on the annual budget will be reduced.

Jill second.

**Ayes:** all, no no’s, no abstentions. Daphne: so moved.

- Sponsorship committee? Develop arm of the organization.

Adam: my committee would work with the money committee

Josh: the sponsorship would start after 2nd year?

Cindy: that’s too late. just a button. At least for now.

Jill: We have the selection committee decided (Adrienne)

What should we focus on? Don’t want to lose things we’ve gained this years.

Jill: shouldn’t be the program committee. Typically it needs to be the President. people on program committee may discover options or opportunities. But then communicate with sponsorship committee

Cindy: Eric, what can your organization help us with? Forming a committee? Thinking long term? Help us with? Whose priorities?
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Eric: yes. Can give you examples of other organizations doing different things. Spectrum of what people are willing to accept. What can the money do? What is it going to cost? Prospectus? Grant writing?

Daphne: letter, prospectus. Who are the people? Does this sound attractive? Who do we send to? Help us find those people.

Eric: Our recommendation early on is to take a targeted approach. Run a campaign to target the 10 most likely to give you money. Publishing houses, academic journals. Right now we get zero. In 2019 we want $20k. we are going to go after these 12.

Adrienne: prospectus? Already developed?

Eric: develop inventory, what you want to sell. Wouldn’t waste money on printing.

But to go to current partners: we have a unique opportunity for you to sponsor this or that. At this breakfast you can come talk about this journal or that. Focus on organizations that are likely to give you money.

Jimmy: Latin American committee doesn’t get money and they are 4K. need to capitalize on what’s long term, what’s possible. Grants and other stuff. Don’t throw too many things into the pot. Make it small to start.


Amy: 101 books, survey books. The books we make our students buy.

Eric: who do you spend money with. Who are you an influencer with? Students spending money? Buying and consuming, making a choice about what the top 5. Going to top 5 publishers of those books. Get that exposure.

Daphne: could be tied into advertisement. Book exhibit.

Eric: exhibit booth, conference page, website, thank you, etc.

Carol: target the publisher of Jose’s books! Sponsor of!

Josh: I inherited his series. Happy to go to Eric at NYU press and do an ask.

Catherine: who tracks the check?

Jill: get a conference app is $3500. It would reduce printing cost. Great sponsorship opportunity. Ads. Ask for $5k.

Amy: amazon? Or bookseller? Or publisher? Live link on the app?

Jill: Committee that needs to draw from outside the EC. Needs to be chaired by the President.

Amy: past presidents, distinguished scholars.

Cindy: people who have expertise in development?

Debra: need a call. From Daphne. Direct ask to past presidents and then a call to members.

Daphne: focus: 1) raise money for Munoz 2)

Catherine: people sponsor things in their interest. Tail shouldn’t wag the dog, but our priorities might not be the same as the money. As far as foundation sponsors: Mellon and ACLS…

Adam: Doris Duke?

Catherine: if you get to being Mellon ready I’d be happy to help.
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- Bigger conversation: digital thing separated from Ewald? Should be part of an officers conversation.
- Too many panels, continuing groups. What if we have pre-conference time for continuing groups.
- Career sessions? Changing
- 12:35 we are back.
- Spring Meeting and Conf. Planners
  - Analola won’t be there. But Jimmy will still be there.
- Jill should we have an established policy. We will always funding 1 program chair to come to the spring meeting, if none of them are on the EC.

Jimmy: At least 2 there. I want to advocate for the host city.

Stephanie: enormously helpful to be at host city.

Jill: would be good then to do it in March. So many things have to be determined by April.

Debra: cost associated?

Jill: nancy negotiated this.

Catherine: that can be really tough, both financially and in terms of time.

Daphne: also meet in Ewald offices. Save money.

Eric: might be able to do things at our offices which would be really inexpensive.

Jill: program chairs come?

Amy: Flying Jill, one Program chair, and Erin? Separate trip.

Jill: we could decide Chicago or Minn. For this year. Separate the issues.

Jill: Ewald, VP, at least 1 program chairs.

Eric: We could host you. Be low cost option in terms of space and food. Av is built in, etc.

Jimmy: save that money then to send them to go visit Atlanta.

Eric: we might not save that much. Erin might be able to get the hotel costs comped. Flight. But night in hotel And lunch.

Cindy: hotel situation here?

Eric: university hotel, negotiated rate. Shuttle to offices. Cost from airport: about the same from here.

**Motion: hold our midyear meeting at offices of Ewald in Minn.**

**Jill: seconded.**

**Ayes:**

**Nays: none**

**Abstentions:**

**Daphne: So moved.**

- Jill: Cindy & I will research a trip to the site for Atlanta.
- Daphne: continuing working groups or not. Size of working groups? Pre-conferences— Thursday mornings? Focus groups? So many panels.
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Cindy: would be extra cost. Av, hotel staff.
Jill: we should have policies… we have this conversation every year…
Catherine: Organizational cognitive impairment.
Jill: that’s a big box to open up. How would we choose. Longer conversation.
- Brandi: direction on double consideration. When we have multiple winners, they get noticed in both but get money in one. If someone wins in two categories, what do we want to do?
Josh: if you win in one category, you receive the money for one, then you get noticed, but the money goes to another prize winner.
Brandi to put that in clear language and share it with everyone for a vote.

1:59 Jill motions, josh seconds, Daphne adjourns.

- Signed conflict of interest forms