

# *American Society for Theatre Research*

## **American Society for Theatre Research Executive Committee Meeting Agenda November 16, 2017 Library, Hyatt, Buckhead Atlanta, GA**

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

In attendance: Cindy Bates, Jill Stevenson, Carol Martin, Debra Caplan, Rhonda Blair, Chrystyna Dail, Yassi Jahanmir, Noe Montez, James Harding, Scott Magelssen, E.J. Westlake, Rose Malague, Esther Kim Lee, Eric Ewald, Elizabeth Son, Jimmy Noriega, Patricia Herrera, Brandi Catanese

Not here: Doug Jones, Kate Bredeson, Adrienne Macki,

**7:30 a.m. Continental breakfast served**

**8:05 a.m. Call to order.**

- 1) Introduce any new people in the room
- 2) Approval of consent agenda
  - a) Includes: agenda for today, meeting notes from September EC Conference call.  
Motion to approve: Jill; Noe seconded. All approved. Motion carried.

**8:10 a.m. President's report (Lei) 20 minutes**

- 1) Strategic planning
- 2) International
- 3) Diversity

International and diversity first: Building these have been my vision. We just did a demographic survey. Almost 15% reside or live outside of the US. Today after our meeting I have a special reception from the international attendees at 3pm. Syrian scholar coming. We should acknowledge these people and the money and time they spend to get here. There are also have people working here who may not have same status. We need to acknowledge this. About 50 people coming. Worth collecting the stories: we have a survey. We don't know what to do with the data yet. Design programs for field conversations. Two Iranians were denied visas.

Diversity. Jose Munoz progress. We had a selection committee, selected the first and second. We've had the conference, revision, met in Indiana, got new drafts, notes. Working on an anthology. Assessment and facilitation committee. Guidelines for all the groups.

Strategic planning: this society. I very often feel moved by your passion and commitment. It's a conscientious organization. We all have a desire to grow but maybe we don't need to grow bigger. Maybe we can grow better, more diverse. What's our priority? What's our vision.

Jill: selection on Munoz: Adrienne moving off. Faedra and John—do it for one more year?

Noe: I was one more year.

2018: Noe is now the EC Rep for the Munoz committee.

Jill: Daphne, get back to me about Faedra and John.

**8:18 a.m.      Treasurer's report (Bates)      20 minutes**

We are doing well financially; investments doing well. Memberships are down a bit, registration up. We've talked about planning for next year's budget. Checking and savings account are healthy. \$857,000 Investments moving into operating budget.

Eric: update. As of today, dues are up over \$76,000 close to \$77,000 budget target. 638 registrants for the conference.

Cindy: raise items. Munoz initiative. We have decided to fundraise for the Munoz and we have not developed

Daphne: formed a fundraising committee. Talked about best way to do it. Also a voice feeling that members shouldn't donate. I talked to ACLS and Mellon about getting grant. They haven't invited me to apply. I'm going back to Catherine and Robin who have been advisers in this fundraising challenge.

Cindy: it's hard to get grants when it's a new initiative.

Daphne: show track record on website.

Jill: I wonder if we want to reach out to particular individuals. Scholarship links to it. I think need to move beyond asking the members.

Daphne: The first group in Indiana put in about \$15000 to have two day conference.

Noe: have we looked into an NEH grant? Members of the organization to support. A member to set up a matching fund.

Daphne: we sent out a letter to the senior scholars to give back. We got \$50 donation from many letters.

Noe: structure in monthly giving.

Rhonda: bequests for current or former members. Include us in your will.

Jill: we purposefully had a way to donate when you register for the conference. How did that work?

Eric: that raised \$140.

Jimmy: Some of the grumblings came from members who were upset that the Munoz didn't open it up for new members.

Cindy: do we want to revisit that?

Elizabeth: we are all contributing to a group. Maybe it will open up again after the book is out.

Carol: what are we hope to get out of it. What is the public face of the group?

Cindy: the book will give us the leverage to get grants.

Liz: the group remains large even if those attending are lower.

James: this seems exclusive. The wrong message perhaps?

Jill: start a conversation over 3 years. Creating a 3 year conversation that will then foster future scholars. We left it very open on purpose. I'm hesitant to change the rules now.

Jimmy: Analola, Josh, and Adam and I crafted the language. Included inviting new members. It looks like people are getting a grant to publish a book. It doesn't look like what it set out to be. Include other people in your conversation. Why are they not coming to ASTR?

Daphne: I don't think it's too late to start talking to the second group.

Cindy: and the first group.

Carol: why have this not generated funds? The discussion is revealing. The face of the project is not enough.

E.J. Maybe that's a question of marketing. Put faces to it.

Cindy: thank you. E.C. committed to fund the whole thing. We will pull from our investments to fund it. My recommendation to EJ and Eric is that we make sure to have a budget, marketing plan, etc. when we set up an initiative like that.

Budget requests need to go to EJ and Eric on Feb. 1. They will bring this budget to you.

Thank you.

Jill: Before we move on: who is going to talk to the Munoz group?

Daphne: I will.

Jimmy: the session description does say they have to be open.

Jill: I'm going to change that now for the copy for this year.

**8:50 a.m. Secretary's report (Cook)**

**15 minutes**

1) Committee chart

2) Career Sessions title?

Wait.

3) Liasons?

Daphne: what's major conversation are happening.

Cindy: what was the original purpose of having a liaison? Do the organizations need to talk to each other.

Jill: we've had this conversation before. Formalizing. Should we go back to meeting notes—when Marla was secretary. What are the goals? What do we expect.

Rhonda: it seems to me that it could be useful to have more conversations and connections with these other organizations. Strategize how to resist the collapse of the humanities. Combine reports. Coordinate with the other organizations to have a larger voice?

Brandi: I would echo that. Empowerment Committee! Targeted organizations coming to gether to have meeting.

Cindy: Advocacy summit? VP for advocacy at ATHE? To think about how to resist? Tiffany Lopez.

Carol: I would love to see the presidents of these organizations to put forward a public statement for how to resist, why it shouldn't be going on.

- 4) Spring EC meeting scheduled (4/21)
- 5) January Meeting
- 6) Ad hoc committees. Should there be sunset clauses? Should we have something in Handbook about them? How will you know when you succeed? Guidelines for operation and reports. Goals.

Jimmy: Community engagement committee is temporary. We did not decide to make it permanent. I think we should make it permanent.

Jill: a Sunset clause is good because it forces you to have the conversation. Three year terms. Doing an assessment at the midyear meeting of which need to be assessed. Ec to respond or vote.

James: if it's an ad hoc committee than it's only 3 years. Standing members need to go to membership?

Jill: if the language is in handbook it doesn't need to go to the membership.

James: but if it changes the structure of the organization

Eric: defined in bylaws: program committees, nominating, committee on conferences, Executive Committee,

James: an ad hoc is by definition focused and single-issue and defined term. Put together to answer this question and then the committee dissolves.

Chrystyna: Community Engagement and Empowerment. We have an ongoing need for these. Where does it fall if there are finances attached?

Jimmy: we created the language. The money came from Carbon offset.

Jill: bylaws vs. handbook. They don't line up. Clarifying what we mean by standing committees. What is our process for ad hoc committee to do this.

Eric: leave the by laws alone. Standing committees on both sides. Better definitions.

Rhonda: article 9 in by laws Liaisons and Delegates.

James: reconciling those two will be an incredibly important exercise.

**9:05 a.m. VP for Awards report (Wilkins Catanese) 20 minutes**

1. Targeted travel awards for international attendees
2. Reconsideration of the membership requirement

There's been a recommendation from Brockett essay prize committee: an author may apply for it with one essay. And then a 2 year wait before applying again.

James: which essay would you prefer to be considered?

There aren't hiatuses in other categories.

Scott: the goal of the Brockett is to recognize senior scholars. I wonder if the same small core of people aren't nominated year after year for the Brockett. Assess the field of what's been published.

James: I won the ATHE award and then was asked to be on the committee. That would solve the problem. It's a 3 year term so that would solve it.

Brandi: our decision: new practice for the Brockett prize is to invite the winner to join the committee. Do we feel comfortable having the conversation with the Brockett folks? Two proposals: one entry per year, winner joins committee. International conference participants: do we want to add more prizes or more recipients of prizes. This year there are some very heart wrenching requests for travel money. Do we want to think about the policy of enabling tele-participation for these scholars. What would it mean to develop this mechanism to allow folks to skype in? there are lots of reasons that people can't come.

Jill: I think there's a larger conversation. About conferences. We can't Skype people in. wifi. a/v. what would we charge? Why do we do this? Is it worth it? Is it worth it when people get upset over so many little things. Venue choice.

Jimmy: when we add in these initiatives that are well intentioned, we have to move burden to organizers to make it happen. There needs to be someone on staff who is responsible outside of program chairs. Drowning in problems.

Jill: to think about accommodations: reason we could do this is because we put money behind it. We had people who had that expertise from organization who could help. A venue and a resource question.

Brandi: we will need to be intentional in our conversations because wanting to be more international may not be sincere if we cannot support them. These are the only mechanisms we have to support this. Developing a special pot to support international attendees.

Jill we need something online about what we finance and what we don't.

Carol: EJ collecting data on funding.

EJ: incredible range in support: some folks have no money, some have a lot.

Professional organizations: their responsibility in terms of what they expect their scholars to be doing. This is a diversity, equity, and inclusion issue as well. What are the barriers?

Amy: I would agree we should support increased advocacy about what scholars do, the importance of conference attendance for faculty.

Cindy: should be a conversation to fund international travelers and a good legacy of Daphne's presidency. For so many years we've had this conversation about access to the conference. My children are both adopted; really tough to get here. We are missing out on keeping people involved when their life circumstances make it hard to be here.

James: international. Jean Graham Jones has been really invested in this for IFTR.

EJ: IFTR chooses venues differently.

Brandi: reconfirm our stipulation that award recipients should be required to be members. Members in good standing at the time of nomination. Rewarding people with engagement to ASTR. Push back: Hewitt and the Hill. That turns it into a clicky prize rather than the one that rewards the best book. I know it was a long and hard conversation in the spring.

Chrystyna: could we ask them to be part of the committee in the following year? That would get them to be

Carol: the mission of the organization is to produce scholars who are deserving of our best awards. I am in favor of members in good standing.

Noe: as we discussed in spring. Many organizations require membership to submit books. "Click" is 724 people of astr.

James: when I was on the committee, my recollection was that the books submitted to us came from publishers. What's important to me is that the members of the committee are in good standing.

Rhonda: from the perspective of the recipient: award is an important line on CV.

Brandi: we stand by our investment in this decision. Publisher does the work. We need to make sure there's language with publishers. It will require a step of double-checking.

Scott: university presses are in trouble. Another way of thinking these awards is supporting our presses. This may be a disservice to our publishers. It's the publicity coordinators at the presses that are doing this.

Brandi: we will move forward. Thank you.

**9:25 a.m. Admin. Report (Ewald)**

**15 minutes**

Eric: I traveled here with 68 pounds of ASTR materials. 16 black and white report. We are a little over 76 to 78. From an income perspective, it's been steady. Increase in numbers. The people is what makes this organization great. 30-40 more registrations! At an all time high in terms of people. Not in dues because of contingent faculty category.

I submitted a written report. Some of the things we do for you that you don't know about: we file your tax return.

Maintain your insurance policy.

I know you will discuss Ewald evaluation and I wanted to acknowledge the summary report that Daphne shared with us. It's personally and professionally important to me. There were some real problems around staffing problem and transparency, made some changes to address. I'm in charge now. Noe and Rhonda. Both are absolute pros. These are some positive changes. Some of it wasn't communicated very well. I've done things like share my cell phone number. I really want to acknowledge that the feedback was very important to us and we want to make strong progress for you. So you all can do really important mission driven work. I make that commitment to you. One idea for a webinar. ATHE did two webinars, they were very successful. Another piece of value. Another platform for someone to represent something. Very vibrant. Someone has to come up with an idea. Slide deck, live webinar. Building library.

Cindy: it's included in our contract so we are wasting money.

Eric: we want to do it. Tech meetings ahead of time. Trouble-shooting. Nice product. We want to demonstrate that value for you. Member recruitment/retention. Free to members. \$50 for non members.

Grant writing fundraising.

Book marketing.

Daphne: is it possible to do a webinar with one person in one space and another person in another place.

Eric: yes, need to be clear and do tech

Jill: some of the field conversations that are really popular reporting out "how tos". I can talk to Page and Gad.

Rhonda: this can be easily accessible

Debra: branding these as part of Field Conversations. Recruitment tool. This is part of what you can get at the conference. Concrete career-building tools. Integrate with social media. Might there be a way to promote that it's happening on social media. Minute of video of last one to promote the next one. Two tier: price for students.  
Eric: Dr. Powell did promote on Facebook.  
Yassi: use the fee toward memberships.

**9:40 a.m. Graduate Student Caucus Report (Jahanmir) 15 minutes**

We have a new GSC we've had 14 people self-nominate. If you need contact info., let me know.

170 participants this year of mentorship breakfast! Partially because it was embedded in registration. We suggest continuing this.

Creating a new GSC position: do we need EC approval?

As a result of these discussions, the GSC proposes the addition of a new cabinet position: a diversity advocacy position. This position would act as an advocate for underrepresented graduate student populations and find various ways to ensure that they feel supported at ASTR. As this is a new position, a more concrete list of responsibilities would be developed in the first year or two of the position.

List-serv: can it be automatically updated?

Eric: it's static, we should huddle to discuss.

Yassi: Sissy coordinated with field conversations. In terms of volunteers: 15 is enough but this is only 6-7 % of our membership. Can we support more grad students?

Eric: athe is having a similar conversation. Other things that can be done at the conference. Maybe there will be 5 people tasked with tweets, fb posts, blogging! Get your fellowship for posting.

Yassi: spread the wealth.

Debra: that would really valuable for us. We could use the wealth. Spreads out the work pre-post conference.

Amy: we could have grad students doing work required for ASTR in general.

Jill: we are working on trying to move the timing of the mentorship breakfast.

Cindy: do we want to make it \$50 rather than the full \$100? Or more people.

Jill: if the will of the grad students is to have more for less money.

Grad students could help Program Chairs.

Yassi: I move that we have more people (30 positions) at \$50/ piece. Jill Seconded.

Eric: that's better.

Jill: put on the list for February. It's ok for now. Figuring out work will happen with GSC and officers.

Eric: should we have a little more discussion through the conference and then come back to this as part of budget request.

Yassi: we want to have more of an impact.

Cindy: yassi going back to GSC to see will of GSC. Put it into budget request. Aim high.

**10:13 a.m. BREAK 15 minutes**

10:25 a.m. VP for Publications (Lee)

40 minutes

1. Electronic publications position for 21<sup>st</sup> Century
- 2.

Description of the Electronic Publications Associate Editor position in ASTR Handbook:

---

Another role the VP for Publications oversees is the ASTR Electronic Publications Associate Editor. The duties of this position include: soliciting and editing Member News following a quarter system (Spring/ Summer/ Fall/ Winter); submitting the results to the ASTR Communications Manager for posting on the website; assisting the ASTR Communications Manager in proofing and copyediting the website material, checking to see that links are functional, alerting the Communications Manager when information becomes out of date, and checking for accuracy and stylistic consistency. The Electronic Publications Associate Editor position is appointed for a two-year term commencing in January.

The Electronic Publications Associate Editor position is appointed for a two-year term commencing in January. Candidates will be reviewed and selected by the Publications Committee and the ASTR Communications Manager. The Associate Editor collaborates with the Communications Manager and reports to the Vice President for Publications.

---

Call for Applications - Electronic Publications Associate Editor

Applications are invited for the position of ASTR Electronic Publications Associate Editor. The duties of this position include: soliciting and editing Member News following a quarter system (Spring/Summer/Fall/Winter); submitting the results to the ASTR Communication Specialist for posting on the website; assisting the ASTR Communication Specialist in proofing and copyediting the website material, checking to see that links are functional, alerting the ASTR Communication Specialist when information becomes out of date, and checking for accuracy and stylistic consistency; **and updating and overseeing ASTR's social media accounts (primarily Facebook and Twitter) both during and between ASTR's annual conferences.** The Electronic Publications Associate Editor position is appointed for a two-year term commencing in January 2018.

We have a new person on board: Danielle Rosvally. We need to update the handbook to include online and social media. But the conversation we need to have: how to expand the role. Maximize this person's position. Social media publication. Expand membership news? Create an online only journal? Another journal? Bigger, ambitious project. Feedback. Collect ideas. Discuss with my committee and bring to spring meeting.

Chrystyna: would love to see a new journal. Combine the things we've discussed. Mentorship, how to go to associate to full, holding hands with the empowerment committee. Don't see a lot that are dedicated to professional aspects.

James: this organization sponsors Theatre Survey. Caters to a specific type of scholarship: theatre history. Digital journal—I favor—if we created one that catered specifically to digital humanities? Part and parcel of theatre history. Complements existing journal we have.

Scott: I chaired joint athe and astr task force on digital scholarship, one recommendation is to recognize digital scholarship and reward that at our conference. A platform for digital scholarship. What can be done digitally that print scholarship does not allow. Other forms of knowledge production. Bringing in visual arts and design.

Carol: the design thing is major; so important to what we can do in that medium. Special features available only online. Enhance Theatre Survey.

EJ: That's what we are doing as Theatre Journal. Putting things on line that complements.

Esther: Cambridge has that. It is there. Would rather start with something small. Other ways to be more productive in sharing our news.

Noe: hiring a joint online editor for Topics and TJ. More digitally-focused articles.

Esther: who is responsible for updating the website?

Eric: Noe.

Daphne: I see something that's wrong and I write to Noe.

Eric: not the curator.

Daphne: I want to add this thing, I wrote to Noe and he did it. Are you saying we need to have someone who is coordinating.

Esther: it's random. It's unclear. One sheet of paper to explain how the website is maintained.

Jill: I send things directly to Noe but others send it through me. Communication with him to establish how quickly things need to get done.

Daphne: is there a monthly or quarterly update routine? So that all the things get updated periodically.

Esther: I will take some of these ideas and talk to the communication committee. I'd like to compensate this person. IF the role is to expand, it would be good to compensate.

Holly Buttimore (10:30)

Holly invited in (10:43).

Thank the editors for their hard work. Nick is doing a fantastic job. Finances for the journal are steady. Accounting error. Circulation is 2500 institutions around the world. Usage for the journal is rising. It's important to have it available but usage is almost more important. Marketing presence for the journal. Dr. Emma Pile is the new marketing director. Great editor. Cambridge Core launched last year. Won a number of industry awards. Suggestions for other things to read.

Open access. Social sharing. Research Gate, e.g. We are launching a social sharing site of our own. Academia.edu It's in breach of copyright to have them up on the site. Authors are increasingly want to do that. If you would be interested in doing that with Theatre Survey I can let you know. There's a nice variety of downloading institutions around the world. We have also worked with Author Aid. Mentoring service for people from developing countries who are trying to publish. Questions?

Esther: Electronic access: what functions are available?

Holly: smart pdf, embedded video, permissions are tricky. In line musical examples. Abstracting and indexing services. Proquest, ebsco. We've worked harder on search engine optimization. We do a lot of work with Google and optimizing our Metadata. Directing through hyperlinks in index. Work with libraries to make it as easily to get to as possible. About 98% of Theatre Survey readers access online.

Esther: can we add other articles that aren't in the journal?

Holly: yes, but it might be better to just add more pages.

Publish final version of the article early online and then it waits to come out in print later.

Carol: time sensitive?

Holly: the finished article would be published online, part of journal. Citable with a DOI--Digital object identifier. Notifications that go out immediately. Then first views come down.

James: how do we track?

Holly: we can track through many different ways. People come through Google. Other than that it's through library systems.

James: Jstor. Is how I do it. Is that how it's happening. Or Cambridge online journals.

Holly: I'd have to look into that.

Eric: with the development with Cambridge Core, do we need to change links from website.

Holly: I think that's been handled

Esther: I think the links were updated after the spring meeting.

Carol: MIT publishes the rankings of articles based on hits.

Holly: we can do that but it can be a popularity contest. Most cited, most referenced. Alt-metrics.

**11:05 a.m. VP for Conferences (Stevenson)**

**55 minutes**

1. 2019 Program Chairs and Call—Vote to approve CoC recommendation for Program Chairs and Theme of 2019 conference review and vote on proposal for 2019 in Arlington.

James: dream team. I like this proposal a lot. But Arlington is not D.C. It's a vantage onto DC and the cemetery. Historical issues of race that have defined our country.

Jimmy: we were asked to engage with Atlanta a lot but then we got to Buckhead. As we move forward, we should think about how much we want to make folks address the city. Move to approve proposal with some changes. Brandi seconds. All in favor: aye. No nos and no abstentions.

2. Proposed Handbook changes to limit number of Program Chairs. Discuss intention and language. Vote to approve.

With expanding number of program chairs, I'm proposing to limit number. We cover conf. registration cost, the year prior and the year of the conf we cover their hotel. We have also committed to send them to the hotel in a site visit of their conference year. It really helps to do a site visit. Be aware of the finances. Communication is hard enough and adding so many program chair is going to complicate things. We asked them to reconsider and they held firm. Would be an easy handbook change. On page 47.

Program chairs limited to 3. We pay for 3.

Motion to limit: Brandi seconded. All in favor: aye. No noes, no abstentions.

3. Proposed Handbook changes regarding limits on presentations in a single conference. Discuss intention and language. Vote to approve.

**Current Language:** To notify plenaryists and group conveners of their acceptance and draw to their attention guidelines posted on the ASTR website together with deadlines specific to that year's conference, including that plenaryists cannot present two years in a row and members can apply to only one working session;

**Proposed Language:** To notify plenaryists and group conveners of their acceptance and draw to their attention guidelines posted on the ASTR website together with deadlines specific to that year's conference, including that plenaryists cannot present two years in a row and that individuals may only present work once in a given conference (e.g. participate in one working session, deliver one plenary or curated panel paper); although customarily introducing a panel, facilitating a career session/field conversation, or convening a working session without sharing one's own work does not constitute participation, the Program Chair/s work with the Vice President for Conferences to address questions about these distinctions when they arise;

**Current Language:** The Program Chair checks all provisional working session lists to ensure that no one is listed for two sessions or for participation in both a working session and a plenary, and asks conveners to notify the panelists of their acceptance. All groups should be confirmed and all abstracts (edited and approved by individual conveners) forwarded to the program chair by the end of June

**Proposed Language:** The Program Chair checks all provisional working session lists to ensure that no one is presenting work in more than one working session and/or panel during the conference, and asks conveners to notify the panelists of their acceptance. All groups should be confirmed and all abstracts (edited and approved by individual conveners) forwarded to the program chair by the end of June;

**In addition, in several places the handbook references conference "guidelines" that can be found on the website. I searched and found no such guidelines. I've drafted the language below as proposed guidelines for our discussion. Also, where would we post this?**

Conference Participation Guidelines

ASTR's annual meeting is an opportunity to participate in and shape the scholarly landscape as participants share and provide feedback on the latest work in theatre and performance studies. In order to engage a diverse set of voices and provide space for a wide range of work, plenarists may not deliver papers two years in a row and participants may only present work once at each annual meeting. Presenting work is typically defined as delivering a plenary paper or presenting and/or sharing work as part of a curated panel, roundtable, or working session. Customarily, introducing a panel, facilitating a career session/field conversation, or convening a working session without sharing one's own work does not constitute participation. However, the Program Chair/s and Vice President for Conferences reserve the right to determine on a case-by-case basis what constitutes presenting work based upon the particularities of a given session or conference event. Those participating in or delivering work at the conference are not required to be members of ASTR.

Should also be on the call for working groups.

Rose: are there not one or two working groups that continuing working groups?

Jimmy: Curated Panels. I'm concerned with what they are moving forward. They want AV. They compete against plenaries. Juggling difficult. Maybe it's the EC's job to put language on the curated panels. Are they still fulfilling the roles they were meant to fill.

James: if we do keep the curated panels. Limitation one might put together a curated panel. Same as plenary group?

Jill: raises their status to that of a plenary. Maybe we should change who gets to curate the panels.

Carol: that's a great idea

Debra; that doesn't allow for more increased participation. It's being chosen.

Jill: maybe you are choosing the curators, they have open call.

Rhonda: distinction between focus and narrowness.

Jill: I'd like to table this.

Move to approve language: Jill makes motion to approve. Noe seconds. Ayes: all eyes, no nos, no abstentions.

4. José Esteban Muñoz Targeted Research Working Session—EC needs to determine membership of selection committee  
Done.
5. Rectifying empty slots on the Committee on Conferences (EC rep [2017-2019; Member-at-large [2017-2019])  
This should have been done as part of the election. We've rectified the member at large question (Michelle Liu Carriger). Rose, Jim, Doug just finished.  
Language changes, policy discussions, July-August proposal reading. Rose volunteer to do it! Rose Malague (EC Rep) (2017-2019)
6. Discuss Career Session coordinator possibilities to take over after 2018 conference  
Three year cycle. Gad and Page will be cycling off. Noe Montez has agreed to do it. Should there be a second person. Should be appointed by February so they can shadow Gad and Page. Chrystyna Dail agrees to do it. But it's appointed by president so it can be discussed.

7. Conference structure questions—goal of conference?  
Too big to discuss right now.
8. Allow remote participation for international participants  
Brandi covered.
9. Accommodations budget reflections  
I will be putting in a request to increase it. It was really necessary and a great thing to be able to offer. Would like to commit to keeping it and increasing it.
10. Budget an upper amount of money to support conference planners (site visits, etc)  
What are we willing to commit in terms of sending folks to San Diego. A staff member from Ewald and two people.  
Cindy: we have 2000 in the budget for it.  
Jill we get hotel for free. We can have Rhonda check on pricing. How many people do we send?  
Cindy: we covered flights and transportation to and from hotel.

11. Discuss of potential cities for 2020 conference  
Rhonda needs to send out an RFP. Need to have that contract signed by March.  
Should be South: Memphis, Durham, Nashville, New Orleans, Charleston,  
Some folks have suggested Columbus.  
Decision made by VPs and President.  
Scott: Durham it's hard to get to conference hotel.  
Esther: Columbus would be good because there's a phd program at Ohio State that needs our support.  
Jill: we could do rfps for Columbus and New Orleans.

What is the general feeling about date? Early or later? Sometimes it's just dictated by when the hotels are available. It goes back and forth pretty regularly.

EJ: Ohio is not a right to work state. I would pitch my hat in for any state that's pro union.

12. Reflections on sponsorship
13. Reflections on technology/wifi/a.v.  
We have heard very vehement responses about the lack of AV. We should give people a strong numeric sense of how much more it would take to have AV. We want more food, we want grad student money. So the members should understand. It's not the priority in the budget. Is there a numeric we can offer at the membership meeting to explain.  
Eric: I had a # in the report. ATHE had all focus groups together in a room and we discuss how much it is and whether or not it's worth it. Access and AV.  
Daphne: \$10 more isn't such a big deal.  
Jimmy: It becomes a question of inconvenienced. USB not that hard. People complain but they make due. Some of the complaints are about ease.  
Jill: these are the other ways you can use technology. Other ways to achieve that goal.  
Debra: long term: scholarship is changing. If we can't offer AV and wifi we are limiting the kind of scholarship we can support.  
Jill: that's an investment then.  
EJ: hacks to make these things happen. An online list of brainstorming: QR code.

Jimmy: As part of application: I need AV. Are you willing to be accepted if you don't get AV. How many can we fund. Puts it out directly. Purchase it yourself—it's \$650.

Rose: if more people understood the finances we won't have push back.

Jill: I'll present this to the membership.

Eric: I just redid the math: it's about \$45/per person for AV.

Jill we only have it in the plenary space.

Jill: last year we were able to present AV in one of the break-out groups. If we did say ok, we have it in one room. How can we do that? That will be 8 break out sessions will have AV. If you don't have it will you still come?

They find out after the fact and that's frustrating. They have to rethink what they submitted. Respecting them and their work. Need to be transparent?

**12:00 p.m. Lunch 30 minutes**

**12:33 p.m. 2017 Program Chairs 15 minutes**

Report last night. Conference structure. Fewer rooms and start later. It was a challenge. We got everything we wanted in there. We have two performances. AStr more inclusive and diverse. How it was applied to working sessions, plenaries, and curated panels. Have been able to attract a more diverse crowd. 104 plenary submissions. 20 plenary papers. Happy to bring Rosemary Garland Thompson who inspired our theme. Katia who is also involved.

Jill note: this was the last contract that Nancy negotiated.

We appreciate the work that Gad and Page did but become a driving force for conference [? --sm]. Pushed to get them a bigger time slot. We have one day of field conversations. Have become much larger than originally intended. We were limited by this because it requires early deadlines. We lose other programming.

Jen Scott: Including more folks in submission process—Josh was a whiz at this but a lot of extra work fell to the working group session chairs and us. We weren't able to modify the process yet.

Want to thank Jill and Cindy to increase accessibility. There's a line in the budget for it now.

Cindy: what did we contract in this way.

Jimmy: 3 ASL translators, audio, microphones, Around \$5000 spent. Notice for accommodation requests went out early so we could budget and price-compare. At some point might be good to have an accessibility person who doesn't change year to year.

Jill: we were lucky to have a hotel that was already accessible. We might need to think about expertise in a more broader way.

Jimmy: quotes re: AV. "digital divide".

Advice to future chairs: amount of rude and entitled emails come to the planners was shocking to us. This type of communication is not appropriate. A lot of it tied to curated panels. Paternalistic.

James; this is bullying. This requires a response from the VP or Pres that emails back to say "this is entirely inappropriate response". These emails came to us as well. We have junior scholars this time.

Jill: It's rankism. We can make internal changes to the curated panels.

Kirsten: we used to have working groups. They were entitled. Banning people? Disqualified. If people don't understand that email is not private, it might be time for them to learn. People should know.

Jill: some of this comes out of feeling abused by the process and lack of transparency. What you get and don't get. Goals of curated panels. As was indicated ..."

Scott: I think that there is an entitlement and an arrogance that is coming from a particular generation of scholars who are feeling threatened. When I did it, we did not get bullying as two white males.

Jimmy: it's helpful to have someone who is a member of the EC so we knew we were

Cindy: there needs to be a formal response. We have to stop it otherwise we are part of it.

Jill: I've had someone screaming in my face. Yelled at over squash. Conferences change and we need to be clear. We do not want to have the same conference we 20 years ago. If you aren't going to be flexible, come on!

Daphne: too much theory"

Chrystyna: I think something should come from Daphne. We wanted to do something on Bullying. Might be valuable for the Empowerment committee to come back together to deal with this.

Patricia: what are our values? We value inclusivity. We value diverse intellectual communities.

Jill: ethical communication.

Noe: Is there anything in our bylaws about when the field conversations need to happen?

Kirsten: I complained last night about not getting a plenary. We should publicize the numbers.

Jill: it might be useful when we send out the call for the working sessions, to say that this percentage of folks got it. And there are specific programming goals.

Chase: organization itself is made out of people who are part of the organization. Get involved.

Brandi: I appreciate the way you suggest to put it into a survey so it's a membership question so they can own it.

Jill: how would you feel... we can update survey. Telegraphs flexibility.

**12:30 p.m. 2018 Program Chairs**

**10 minutes**

We have 3.5 things: a) being able to move us offsite. Thursday afternoon could be a visiting time. Or solicit folks who want to go offsite. Apply if you want your working session to go offsite. Entry fee for San Diego zoo. Get to border. Just getting outside of the hotel in general. Experimenting with ways of doing that. Tickets to shows, supporting the local community. Buy a block of tickets. Off site. Bring in more of the city into the confines of the hotel. Working sessions engaging with local sites.

App. We want the app.

Christin: pay for grad students or contingent faculty to be part of the lunches.

Jill: currently the \$25 doesn't cover the box lunch.

Crowdsourcing food.

Sponsors and fundraising. Asking departments to kick in money to co-sponsor reception.

Jill: we've done a lot of this in the last few years to try and do this. We should work with Eric on how to do this and we just don't get the results. Last year there was more food because it was an anniversary year.

Daphne: in SD with UCI and UCSD to try and get some funds, but I'll try.

Chase: keynote plenary. Feedback.

Jill: ASTR has been resistant to a key note. "Keynote Plenary" a way to try and compromise.

Noe: host tell- me booth which will get some info.

Jimmy: our membership loves to complain, it doesn't like to praise.

Carol: An initial reaction to something does not mean it won't grow to be popular. I like the idea of a keynote plenary because the conceptualization of the theme of the conference is communicated.

**1:18 p.m. Discussion**

1. Ewald evaluation

Eric stepped out.