

ASTR
American Society for Theatre Research

Minutes of the Spring 2011 ASTR Executive Committee Meeting
Southern Methodist University, Owen Art Center 1030
Dallas TX
February 26-27 2011

Saturday 26 February 2011

Present: Rhonda Blair (President), Stacy Wolf (Vice President), Wendy Arons (Secretary), Tobin Nellhaus (Treasurer), Nancy Erickson (Administrator, *ex officio*), Kimi Johnson (GSC Representative), Sandra Richards, Dorothy Chansky, Laura Edmondson, Scott Magelssen, Gay Cima, Brian Herrera, Heather Nathans, Elinor Fuchs

Absent: Mike Sell, Penny Farfan, Patricia Ybarra, Susan Bennett (joined the meeting via Skype at 10 am).

The President called the meeting to order at 8:24 am.

1. Adoption of the Agenda.

MOTION: To adopt the agenda prepared by the President for the Spring 2011 Meeting. Moved by Nathans, seconded by Nellhaus. Approved by acclamation.

2. Approval of November 2010 meeting minutes.

MOTION: To approve the Minutes of the Fall 2010 EC Meeting, with subsequent electronic votes. Moved by Nathans, seconded by Edmondson. Approved by acclamation.

3. President's Report-Blair

The President noted some amendments to the committee appointments—Harley Erdman is no longer on the Finance Committee; the committee to adjudicate Grants for Researchers with Heavy Teaching Loads has been added to the list; Tobin Nellhaus has been appointed TLA liaison; and the TLA liaison to ASTR is Susan Brady.

MOTION: to approve the President's 2011 committee appointments & memberships as amended. Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Nathans. Approved by acclamation.

The Secretary noted that the President needs to look into whether or not we need a new liaison to SDHS; Nadine George-Graves is listed on the website but is no longer the liaison.

Fundraising Committee: The President directed attention to Tracy Davis's letter and data on fundraising efforts. Funds raised in last few months have mostly been due to calls for the new Brockett and Chinoy awards—targeted requests yield more money, but there are issues pertaining to the way investments are managed that we will address later in the meeting when we take up the Treasurer's report.

New Paradigms in Graduate Education Committee: we are faced with the question of how to move forward on this initiative. The Membership survey yielded important information on who our members are, we now need more information on institutions and programs, and may need to gather more data in order to move forward with initiatives to help address the needs of graduate students and graduate programs.

4. Vice President's Report – Wolf

The Vice President announced that plans for the 2011 conference are proceeding smoothly, and that the program committee is currently reviewing and ranking plenary proposals. Since all of the plenary proposals are judged blind until very late in the process, the committee does not at this point know whose proposals they have reviewed.

The Vice President requested EC feedback by March 11 on the following items having to do with future planning:

- 1) comments on responses to on the Call for Papers for the 2012 Conference;
- 2) suggestions regarding locations for 2013;
- 3) suggestions regarding conference planners for 2013;
- 4) suggestions on the question of theme for 2013, and in particular opinions about whether or not the 2013 conference should be unthemed given the general nature of the 2012 conference as planned;
- 5) material for a handbook for working group session leaders—i.e, best practices and tips from successful leaders. If any EC member has had experience leading a working group, or has ideas about how best to lead a working group, please send along.

The Vice President noted that the handbook for working group leaders will eventually be a 'living document' on the website.

5. Secretary's Report—Arons

a) MOTION: that the following be added to the end of paragraph VII.B.2.b in the Handbook:

"In putting such an e-vote before the EC, the Chair will stipulate a debate period on the motion. Any member may request an extension of the debate period if that member feels the time allotted is insufficient for full consideration of the motion; such a request obligates the Chair to extend the period for debate. Procedures for amending, calling the question, and voting on e-votes that do not require a special meeting are the same as those outlined in Section B.4.a, B.4.b. and B.4.c below."

Moved by Arons, seconded by Chanksy. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

b) MOTION: that the section of the handbook under VII.B.3 that currently reads:

"A minimum of one week's notice— more if possible—of the commencement of an electronic meeting must be made by email to all voting members. Specifying the quorum required, the Chair will poll EC members to ascertain their availability to participate. Notice of a special meeting does not necessarily occur once a motion is made but can anticipate the likelihood of a motion arising from the discussion. In effect, then, notice of a special meeting alerts EC members to the likely circumstance of a motion being made and leading to a binding vote."

be amended to read as follows:

"The Chair may announce a special meeting by emailing all voting members of the EC with notice that a special meeting is being called, specifying the purpose of the meeting and the quorum required, and giving EC members 2 weekdays to respond via email and affirm their availability to participate electronically. Once the specified quorum is established, the Chair may call the meeting to order. If a quorum is not established within 2 days, the Chair may opt to either 1) extend the deadline to meet the quorum, 2) re-schedule the meeting at a later date, or 3) bring the subject up at a regular meeting."

Moved by Arons, seconded by Nellhaus. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

6. Graduate Student Representative Report—Johnson

The GSC Representative noted that the main concern for the GSC at present concerns the heavy investment of time and energy on the part of GSC members in the silent auction; a recent audit of the time spent organizing and running the silent auction revealed that there is a huge investment of time for a relatively small return in money raised; moreover, the person working the silent auction does not get to participate in the conference, for which they've paid a fee. In addition, this year, there are no volunteers for the committee. In discussion members of the EC noted that the auction seemed overwhelming, and that putting graduate students in the position of fundraising for the organization might not be appropriate; it was also noted that a benefit of the auction was that members could get a sense of who the active organized members of the GSC are. The President agreed to talk with the Chair of the Fundraising Committee about turning over the auction to a different set of people to run, perhaps in modified form (one suggestion was to sell relatively low-cost raffle tickets (at \$2 or \$5/ticket) for one or two free memberships and/or some select "fetish objects," this might raise the same amount of money with much less investment of time and labor). The GSC Representative noted that if GSC members did not have to run the silent auction they could raise the visibility and activity of GSC members at the conference through the Ambassador Program.

7. Fellowships and Awards Report—Chansky

The Director of Awards and Fellowships had been planning to reconstitute some of the committees to even out the workload, but since the rotations for committees have only just been

put back on track she has decided to postpone changing any committees for the time being. This can be revisited next year.

The Director asked EC members for suggestions about how we can get more applicants for those awards that had so few applicants last year (in 2010 there were no applicants to the GRHTL award, the Collaborative Research award had only 1, etc.) The deadlines are coming up. It was suggested that an email to the membership reminding members of upcoming deadlines might prompt potential applicants to look at the awards pages to see if there are awards they might be eligible for. The Director will draft an email with upcoming deadlines, send to Nancy Erickson to have posted on the website and sent both to the member list and to the listserv.

Other suggestions that came up in discussion:

- Link advertising the awards to other correspondence, i.e., advertise conference travel awards with the CFP, the acceptance of proposals, the Call for Working Sessions, and the acceptance of Working Session proposals;
- EC members could be proactive about contacting colleagues at institutions with heavy teaching loads to alert them to the existence of those awards and offer to help with proposals.

The President put this issue on the agenda for discussion in the afternoon's breakout groups.

a) MOTION: that the Keller application must include at least one letter of recommendation from a current ASTR member. Moved by Chansky, seconded by Magelssen. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

b) MOTION: that the position of Director of Fellowships and Awards be made a Vice Presidency. Moved by Chansky, seconded by Nathans. After discussion, Cima moved to table the motion and was seconded by Nathans. Vote to table: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion was tabled.**

The President put this issue on the agenda for discussion in the afternoon's breakout groups.

8. Publications Chair Report—Bennett (via Skype)

a) MOTION: That the allocation of the \$1500 award in support of the *Theatre Survey* editorial team be flexible and considered on a year-by-year basis. The editor of *Theatre Survey* will be required to submit a written request to the Chair of Publications Committee and the Treasurer each January with a plan for the use of funds. This will be forwarded to the EC as part of the Publications Committee report at the Spring Meeting with a recommendation from the Publications Chair for approval or amendment. Moved by Bennett, seconded Chansky. Vote: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

The Publications Chair noted that this year the recommendation will need to come to the EC for electronic vote once she has received the request from the editors.

The Publications Chair announced that CUP is interested in sponsoring panels at the conference, and also in offering free books as a conference prize of some kind. The Vice President agreed

that making *Theatre Survey* more prominent at the conference is a good idea, and suggested that the program chairs, the Publication Chair, and she could brainstorm ways to move forward on the idea.

The Administrator asked how much the price per person will be for three issues of *Theatre Survey*. The Publications Chair will get clarification from CUP and forward the information to the Administrator.

b) Discussion of Webmaster & Contract

The Publications Chair directed attention to the website document circulated with the Spring Reports. She noted that there are three distinct issues that need separate discussion, and that going forward the EC will need to establish clearer guidelines. The three issues are:

- 1) Expectations of the website—the current website is much more interesting, but we need to decide what we want it to do. Omasta's longer document suggests that quarterly publication of *ASTROOnline* content would be a good approach to managing newsletter content, but there are other things that need publishing on an irregular and/or time-sensitive basis (i.e., EC meeting minutes, updating committee lists, etc.) We need to establish some regular means of routing information, at present there are "too many cooks."
- 2) Defining responsibilities of the Webmaster and Web Editor, and establishing a clearer reporting chain. We need simple, clear documents that outline who is responsible for what.
- 3) Performance review of Jim Groom, who is under contract until May 1.

EC members noted the following in discussion of the first issue, "expectations of the website":

- There is a tension between the desirability of having a website with fresh content and the amount of work that is involve in quarterly posting of new materials plus intermittent updating; the workload on those tasked with generating material is heavy.
- The handbook tasks the Secretary with certain web content management (committee lists, minutes, reports for EC meetings); in past, the Secretary has also upated pages that are more properly the Webmaster's responsibility.

The EC determined the following in discussion of the second issue, "defining responsibilities of the webmaster and editor and establishing a clearer reporting chain":

- We need to streamline the process for getting updates to the Webmaster; this is an Administrative task, the link between the organization and the Webmaster should be the Administrator, who will then have oversight over the Webmaster and can report back to the EC.
- Some content will go through the Web Editor (who works on generating content) and then to the Administrator to send to the Webmaster for posting; other content can go directly to the Administrator. The Publications Committee needs to help determine what is "boilerplate" (can go directly to the Administrator) and what is "editorial" (to go through the Web Editor).
- Both the Web Editor and the Webmaster report to the Administrator, who reports to the Publications Chair. This mimics the relationship between the Publications Committee and the

editors of *Theatre Survey*—the PC does not meddle in what they do, but they report to the EC through the Publications Committee.

-This is the time to end the Secretary's direct editing of the Website; the Secretary will forward materials to the Administrator for the Webmaster to post to the Website. The Director of Awards and Fellowships will also send materials to the Administrator for publishing on the web. The Administrator will take responsibility for making sure that time-sensitive materials are published in a timely and efficient manner.

-The Administrator will report on the performance of the Web Editor and Webmaster in her Fall and Spring Reports to the EC.

The Publications Chair requested that EC members send notes and suggestions about guidelines to go into the documents outlining the responsibilities for the Webmaster and Web Editor by the end of March, to help her to draft a contract for the Webmaster and a description of duties for the Web Editor.

The third issue, "performance review of Jim Groom," brought forth the following comments and recommendations:

-Jim Groom's work on the Website to date has generated feedback both positive and negative, some directly related to his performance, some related to the changes to the website and the changing scope of the job. There have been frustrations about timeliness and accuracy; however, we don't pay him much.

-He is getting requests from many people, including the Editor, the Director of Fellowships and Awards, the Secretary, the Administrator, and the President. The lack of one point person has made his ability to respond more challenging.

- He took it upon himself to revise and revamp the look of the website; he came up with the concept and saved us a good deal of money.

The President asked members of the EC to email her specifics about his performance by the end of March.

9. Administrator report – Erickson

-The Administrator pointed out that her report has historical membership numbers that might be useful to have. She also noted that because of the mixup on the date for early registration for the conference this past fall, we might have gotten more members earlier. We also sent out a paper mailing which seems important to many members.

-There has been a lot of work on the new website.

-Conferences are now planned out until 2012. She will be going to Montreal to look at the hotel for the 2012 conference.

10. Treasurer's report—Nellhaus

Treasurer passed around an updated FY 2011 budget. The organization is currently in good shape financially. Carryover from the economic crash keeps our operating budget a bit on the low side, but next year that will increase.

a) MOTION: to amend the first paragraph of section VII.C.5.d.v in the Handbook to read as follows:

"The maximum annual withdrawal from the portfolio is 4% of the trailing three-year average of the portfolio's value as of December 31 of each year plus investment fees."

Moved by Nellhaus, seconded Nathans. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

b) MOTION: that the EC adopt the following policy on revenue surpluses, adding it to the Handbook as paragraph VII.C.8:

"The Treasurer (in consultation with the Administrator) shall determine whether there is money in ASTR's bank accounts beyond the Society's annual operational needs, and shall advise the EC on whether to transfer an amount to the investment portfolio. If the EC approves, the Treasurer shall the transfer the money within 30 days of approval."

Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Cima. *In discussion, it was determined that this is not an issue of policy but one of procedure.* **The motion was withdrawn.**

The Treasurer will send the Secretary language to include in the Handbook description of the Treasurer's duties and on the Treasurer's calendar, and the Secretary will update the handbook accordingly.

c) MOTION: to use the surplus in the account to fund the previously defunded prizes and awards both retroactively and for the current year. Moved by Cima, seconded by Chansky. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

It was noted in discussion that this would include the following:

For 2009:	\$1000 for the Kahan and Hill awards
For 2010:	\$1000 for the Kahan and Hill awards \$500 for the Banes prize \$500 for the Brockett prize
For 2011:	\$1000 for the Kahan and Hill awards \$500 for the Brockett prize
Total:	\$4500

d) Discussion of budget proposal for 2012

i) MOTION: to allow a partner and/or family member to pay the same conference rate as Student/Retired. Moved by Cima, seconded by Wolf. Vote: 9 yes, 0 no, 3 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

In discussion, it was noted that the policy would need to be written in such a way as to make clear that the partner/family member would have to accompany a regular paying member. The Treasurer agreed to draft language to accompany the new rate and circulate it among the officers for suggestions and approval.

ii) MOTION: that the EC approve the Treasurer's budget proposal for FY2012, incorporating the changes listed in the Treasurer's Report, along with any decisions resulting from the discussion of revenue surpluses and other items the EC may decide upon. Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Fuchs. **The motion was tabled.**

Discussion of the budget proposal centered on the proposal to raise fees for graduate student members. EC members expressed a desire to use some of the current surplus to help offset the costs of the conference and not raise rates this year, because there is still a financial crunch at many institutions and because the conference will be hosted in a more expensive locale. Could we move to a tiered membership rate? The Treasurer had proposed one several years ago but it was not taken up at the time; perhaps now is the time to consider restructuring membership on a tiered basis. The President noted that a proposal for tiered membership could be brought to the Fall meeting, for next year; at present we do not have enough information to make a decision.

The Treasurer calculated the budget implications: if we do not raise rates for graduate students this year, it would add \$4100 to the proposed budget.

A rate raise or restructuring is inevitable in future. EC members felt it would be wise to alert the membership to the necessity of a change in the near future, and communicate that we were able to hold rates steady this year, but that change will come in the following year. It is important to calendar the change; the Treasurer should be able to bring a proposal for tiered membership rates to the next EC meeting.

The Chair of the New Paradigms committee expressed concern that we may not have set aside enough of the surplus; the New Paradigms initiative might need funding, and a final budget proposal should take the needs of that initiative into account.

The Treasurer agreed to table the motion on the budget proposal until the EC had fully considered the New Paradigms Committee report.

f) MOTION: to add the following sentence to the end of the policy on Conference Fee Waivers (Section VII.C.2 of the Handbook):

"Such conference fee waivers shall be assessed at ASTR member rates."

Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Herrera. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

g) MOTION: that the cut-off date for conference fee refunds shall be one week before the conference, except for cases of medical necessity. Moved by Nellhaus. **The motion was withdrawn.**

In discussion it was determined that this is not a matter of policy but of procedure, and should be included in the handbook section for conference organizers. The Vice President will send the Secretary instructions on where to include this in the handbook.

h) MOTION: to revise the paragraph under Section VII.C.5.a of the Handbook to read as follows (amendments in italics):

"The investment *portfolio* of the American Society for Theater Research (ASTR) exists to support the Society's purposes and objectives. *The investment portfolio shall be understood to include all of its mutual funds, stocks, bonds, and/or cash equivalents such as certificates of deposit and money market accounts; but not including checking and similar operational accounts.* The investments should be managed in a way that provides the Society with income at the highest sustainable level, consistent with maintaining the real value of its assets. The objective is to preserve the real purchasing power of the principal, in order to provide a growing stream of income over time that keeps pace with inflation. *However, during a clear financial emergency, ASTR may expend investment principal.*"

Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Nathans. Vote: 12yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

i) MOTION: to adopt the following policy on donations and gifts, to be added to the Handbook under Section VII.C.8:

"(a) **Fund-raising Language:** When undertaking fund-raising activities or in other ways soliciting donations, the Executive Committee, its committees, and other authorized individuals shall employ language that either (1) does not mention specific purposes; (2) lists purposes (such as awards or recipients) as examples, in a manner that allows flexibility in how the proceeds are actually used; or (3) provides information on how the donations will be managed (e.g., "Your donation will be added to the investment portfolio in accordance with the policies in the ASTR Handbook, available at the website, in order to build the long-term resources available for [purpose] along with ASTR's other activities").

(b) **Investment:** All donations to ASTR shall be added to its general investment portfolio, defined as including money market funds and other cash equivalents. The Treasurer shall have the total of the donations transferred from ASTR's banking account(s) to its investment portfolio on (at minimum) an annual basis.

- (c) **Acceptance of Donations for Designated Purposes:** If the Association receives a donation or gift that is designated for a specific purpose, it shall (1) invest the donation in the manner described above, not in a separate account; (2) send the donor written thanks for supporting that purpose; (3) advise the donor that the gift is accepted under the terms of ASTR's donation and gift policy and how to obtain a copy of the policy (or provide the policy itself); and (4) name the donor (for example, in public documents, or by voice during the annual general meeting) the next time the award is given, unless the donor wishes to be named "Anonymous" or not be named at all. If the amount of the donation, or the sum of all donations for that purpose, is greater than the monetary award when it is next given, at the EC's discretion the donor(s) may be named on subsequent occasions.

A donor who objects to ASTR's gift and donation policy may receive a refund of the exact amount donated, provided the objection is made within one year of the donation.

- (d) **Offers of Donations for Designated Purposes:** Offers of a donation or gift for a designated purpose may be accepted only if the prospective donor accepts the following agreement:

Donor Agreement Form

Statement of Purpose: [In this paragraph, state the donor's intentions.]

Donation Administration: ASTR will administer the donation in accordance with the policies authorized by its Executive Committee, as they may be modified from time to time; the donor has been apprised of the policies in place at the time of the donation. The donor intends that the donation provide continuous, stable and sustainable spending in support of the purposes described above, in accordance with ASTR's spending policy. The donor recognizes that the application of ASTR's spending policy, combined with economic conditions, may cause the market value of the donation to fluctuate above or below the historic book value of the donation.

In the event that at some future time due to changed circumstances, in the judgment of the Executive Committee it becomes impractical to apply the distributions from this donation to the purpose described above, the Executive Committee shall make such modifications to the use of the donation as will appropriately recognize the interests of the donor in coordination with the association's priorities.

Excess Income: If expendable income from the donation grows beyond what is practical to use for the purposes stated above, ASTR may use the excess income to support the association's general operations (which include, among other things, awards and grants, journal publication, and conferences) as determined by the Executive Committee.

Emergency Usage: The donor agrees that because ASTR's ability to support the designated purpose depends on the organization's continued operation, if ASTR undergoes a clear financial emergency, it may temporarily suspend the monetary award, and if necessary, expend principal from the donation by up to the same percentage that it expends the remainder of its investments.

- (e) **Donation Refusal:** ASTR may decline a gift or donation for any reason, such as if the donation specifies the exact dollar amount to be used for a specific purpose or in some other way unduly restricts the management and administration of the donation."

Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Nathans. Vote: 8 yes, 0 no, 4 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

In discussion the following issues and concerns were voiced:

-Donors need to be alerted to the fact that their donations go into a general investment pool; even when they are responding to targeted asks, the money given is generally not enough to fund any given award or prize, given the 4% withdrawal limitation. It is also not practical or possible to segregate funds (there is often a minimum amount to establish a separate fund).

-This only becomes an issue if we have to de-fund an award that has received targeted monies; ASTR needs to make a commitment to funding these awards if we are going to do targeted fundraising.

-Donors tend to both overestimate and underestimate the value of their giving—they overestimate by thinking that, for example, \$3000 is enough to endow a prize (it is not); they underestimate in not understanding how much a restricted gift might grow over the long term and become a large pool of money that can only be used for limited purposes. This can be a problem for the organization, it limits flexibility and change.

-How does this impact really large donations—if a big donor wishes to give enough for an endowment? Accepting a gift with unfavorable terms is not a gift; we reserve the option to turn the gift down.

-This policy may be revised in future; for now it is a good start and helps clarify terms for potential donors.

j) MOTION: to renew the contract with Nancy Erickson as ASTR's Administrator for Fiscal Year 2012 (as amended), with updated fees per the contract submitted with the Treasurer's Report. Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Herrera. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

In light of the earlier discussion regarding oversight of the Webmaster and Website Editor the Treasurer proposed amending the contract to add to the Administrator's duties: "Supervise the Webmaster and Website Editor and report on their activities to the Chair of the Publications Committee." This amendment was accepted; the Treasurer will forward an amended copy of the contract to the Secretary.

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

11. Report from the ad hoc committee on New Paradigms in Graduate Education— Nathans

Nathans explained that the committee aims to take a holistic view of graduate education—it's not just about graduate students but about faculty and about the structures of the institutions in which we work, and about the future of the field—each time a program makes changes to its curriculum, it shifts and redefines the field in some way. The committee is trying to find ways of making its work visible; it is one thing to know that there is a group of people working behind the scenes, and another thing to see that group actively trying to address challenges. The committee has begun to draft a questionnaire (circulated to the ASTR officers before this meeting); in addition, Tracy Davis has offered to create a mentorship program for faculty who are interested in learning how to be better mentors.

The President clarified that this would be a one day preconference workshop, for which we would need to provide a room and some support. Davis has been going through training at her home institution on how faculty can best mentor graduate students, this would be an opportunity for her to share that training with other midcareer and more senior faculty. The idea would be to help them deal with program changes and/or redesigning curriculum to meet changing expectations.

EC members asked for clarification of the problem: why is this initiative needed? Nathans explained that the job market has changed significantly—there are fewer of the tenure-track jobs that graduate faculty have, and it's no longer enough to train students for jobs like ours. How do you rethink what to do with a PhD? For example, "The Versatile PhD" is a website that gives you other "Plan A's", not "Plan B's." The old model of teaching students to be scholars is no longer viable, the available jobs expect candidates to be able to direct. Moreover, many of the available jobs are in very small departments, where candidates will need to generalize.

Nathans noted that graduate students worry about being "written off" by their advisors if they express an interest in alternative careers; the GSC Representative echoed this observation, noting that in many of the career sessions on alternative careers for the PhD the subtext was: don't tell your advisor, they'll abandon you if you aren't interested in a research/teaching career. Nathans commented that mentors have to adjust to the realities of the job market, and ("*Sweet Raisin Danish!*") as professors we need to be more sensitive and responsive to those realities and open to our student's. Some on the EC noted that professors are probably the worst mentors; we only know how to get the jobs we have, we are not good at imagining alternative careers. Nathans responded that there are resources available, there is a list of five to ten alternative career options, but we need to rethink how we mentor and guide potential students, from the moment we accept applications. We may need to be seeking a different kind of student to begin with, or perhaps exercise a different kind of recruiting, so that, for example, if the purpose of the program is only to accept students interested in being professors, that expectation is absolutely clear and transparent.

The President expressed the view that a pre-conference mentorship workshop is worth pursuing; the EC should put its imprimatur on such a workshop. The President will ask Tracy Davis to write up a proposal for the EC to vote on electronically.

The question arose about whether an aim of the New Paradigms Committee was to come up with guidelines on curricular/subject content for PhD programs, i.e., what a student needs to learn, in terms of content, in order to advance the field. Nathans responded that the Committee's concerns are structural, and aimed at understanding how to prepare students for the careers that await them. Are we training future grant writers, they need that skill; future deans, need to be able to read budgets; etc.

Nathans noted that another idea from the committee would be to develop small, regional, one-day events, topic specific, that would be opportunities for brainstorming, collegiality, and discussion outside the national conference, on topics of graduate education, professionalization, emerging scholars' needs, etc. This is an idea that Mike Sell and Charlotte McIvor are developing. The President remarked that one thing that might come out of such regional meetings is a bottom up understanding of the realities of various regions and the job situation in those regions.

EC members expressed some concern that we need more information and a more specific set of goals—if ASTR is going to put its imprimatur on this initiative it should be useful and concrete. If we don't start producing artist-scholars we'll have a problem not just in terms of advancing the field but also in helping our students find jobs. Nathans agreed that more concrete proposals are needed, but at this point a sense of empowerment is also important—ASTR needs to convey the message that we can work to change things at all sorts of levels. At present too many recent and current graduates feel helpless, as do many faculty members.

The Administrator reminded the EC that ATHE has a professional development committee; we should open a conversation with ATHE, perhaps ASTR and ATHE could co-sponsor the regional meetings.

The Committee might also look at models outside the US, for example, in the UK, where programs are structured differently and the definition of what is considered 'in the field' or 'professional' is very different. The President suggested adding an ASTR member who currently works in the UK to the Committee to bring in that perspective.

Nathans expressed a desire to potentially access some funding, for example to proceed with the proposal included in her fall report which would provide funding to support a faculty retreat for a department that wants to rethink program goals and curriculum, or perhaps funding for small grants to offset the cost of participating in the workshop Davis will offer. If the money were not used, it would go back to ASTR. Other potential uses of money might include subsidy for travel to the one day regional events or smaller grants to support curricular revision efforts.

12. Breakout Sessions

The committee broke into smaller groups and were charged by the President to discuss the issues raised by the New Paradigms Report and in the discussion of the Awards & Fellowships Report. Each group was tasked with bringing back three proposals on each of the two subjects. The groups broke for discussion at 2 pm and reconvened at 3:42 pm.

Following is a summary of the ideas and proposals brought back by the three groups. The reports from each group are attached to the minutes as Addenda 1-3.

Awards & Fellowships:

- 1) Break awards into categories on the webpage so that they are easier to identify (i.e. Research/ Travel/ Publication) and add short one-line descriptions of each award. Eliminate the drop down menu and instead have an awards "landing page" with the awards sorted into categories.
- 2) Fold the Co-sponsored Event Award into the Collaborative Research Award.
- 3) Redirect money not awarded for research fellowships to fund travel grants, which have later deadlines.
- 4) Our biggest award is for dance (Cohen); take \$500 to fund an additional travel award.
- 5) Streamline the Brooks McNamara subvention grant application process.
- 6) Allow for nominations for some awards (i.e. the GRHTL award).
- 7) Develop a schedule for publicizing awards to the membership via the database and listserv.
- 8) Combine committees to oversee more than one award each.
- 9) Consider consolidating the myriad award committees into one committee that reviews applications in larger groups (publication, conference-cost, research).
- 10) Look at the issue of succession separately from issues of whether or not the Awards and Fellowships position should be an officer position.

New Paradigms:

- 1) Need to clarify: what are inciting causes for the New Paradigms Committee? What is/are "the problem/s" that New Paradigms aims to address?
- 2) Get statistics on job requirements to help programs re-envision models for teaching and for program structures.
- 3) Develop workshops/resources for faculty to help them envision change in their practices.
- 4) Develop workshops/resources/programs to help graduate students target opportunities outside the profession (possibly subscribe to the "Versatile PhD"?)
- 5) How is success defined at the institutional level? Develop models for gathering data at the DGS level, and a template for tracking data.
- 6) Develop a graduate students' Bill of Rights. (Involve GSC? Possibly look at U Michigan model? Look at other models? Statement of mutual expectations?). Gather models as resources.
- 7) Request clearer model from Tracy re: workshop
- 8) Define the mission, along the lines of: "We are engaging in an appreciative inquiry into the current situation with regards to employment/opportunities in/outside the

profession. How should faculty respond to and imagine the future of graduate education? What role should graduate students play in that process?"

9) Seek and identify exemplary models of "NewParadigms" in effective practice in the the global university, especially those reaching beyond "professional development for young scholars" as their primary intervention.

10) Continue to articulate/define the value proposition of the theatre/performance PhD within theatre/performance departments and within academic units housing theatre/performance departments

13. Budget Proposal for FY 2012

a) MOTION: that the Treasurer shall transfer \$50,000 from the checking accounts into the investment portfolio. Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Herrera. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

The Treasurer displayed an amended FY 2012 budget, with fees reverting to FY2011 levels and funding restored to the awards as established in the earlier motion.

b) MOTION: that the EC approve the Treasurer's budget proposal for FY2012, incorporating the changes listed in the Treasurer's Report, along with any decisions resulting from the discussion of revenue surpluses and other items the EC may decide upon. Moved Nellhaus, seconded Cima. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions **The motion carried.**

14. Adjournment

MOTION: to adjourn. Moved by Arons, seconded by Magelssen. Approved by acclamation. The meeting adjourned to the following day at 5:05 pm.

Sunday, 27 February 2011

Present: Rhonda Blair (President), Stacy Wolf (Vice President), Wendy Arons (Secretary), Tobin Nellhaus (Treasurer), Nancy Erickson (Administrator, *ex officio*), Kimi Johnson (GSC Representative), Sandra Richards, Dorothy Chansky, Laura Edmondson, Scott Magelssen, Gay Cima, Brian Herrera, Heather Nathans, Elinor Fuchs

Absent: Mike Sell, Penny Farfan, Patricia Ybarra, Susan Bennett

The President called the meeting to order at 8:25 am.

1. Consideration of action items coming out of the break-out groups and subsequent discussion.

a) MOTION: that all presenters at the conference must be members of ASTR. Moved by Arons, seconded by Nathans. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

This stipulation should be published in the handbook under the conference section, on the website conference page, on CFP's for plenaries & working sessions, and on the registration form.

b) MOTION: to fold the Co-sponsored Event award into the Collaborative Research award category beginning in 2012. Moved by Chansky, seconded Nathans. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

c) MOTION: that any prize money not awarded for research be redirected to travel grants. The decision to redirect any unused funds would be made at the discretion of the executive committee by electronic vote. Moved by Nathans, seconded by Richards. Vote: 12yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

In discussion, it was noted that currently the deadlines for research awards are earlier than deadlines for travel grants; the redirecting of prize money is only possible if we keep deadlines as they are.

Magelssen agreed to draft a brief article publicizing this policy to the membership for posting on ASTROOnline in April, after the fellowship/grant decisions have been made.

d) MOTION: that \$500 of the Cohen prize be directed to help fund a second Keller award. Moved by Chansky, seconded by Nathans. Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

The Treasurer noted that this is a motion to amend the budget, and will require committing an additional \$300, since the Keller award is an \$800 award.

e) Clarify "student/retiree/spouse, partner, family" policy regarding couples in which both people are theatre scholars.

The Treasurer will draft language to clarify this policy and circulate it among the officers for input and approval.

f) EC Structure

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to an open discussion of the structure of the EC, the question of how to ensure that the Chair of Publications and the Director of Fellowships and Awards are on the EC, and the issue of mentoring new leadership within the organization. The following action items came out of the discussion:

i) The President struck an Ad Hoc Committee on the Structure of the Executive Committee, charged with bringing back concrete recommendations to the EC on the question of the status of the Chair of Publications and Director of Awards & Fellowships. The President appointed the following EC members to the committee: Cima (chair), Richards, Herrera, Chansky, and Edmondson.

ii) The Administrator will create a "Volunteer Questionnaire" to be sent out to the membership to encourage members to indicate areas of service for which they might like to be considered (Awards Committee membership, EC or officer positions, as mentors, etc). This questionnaire can be distributed at the conference or prior, by mail or email. The Administrator will track information gathered via the questionnaire and forward it to the appropriate person (i.e. President for Awards Committees, Nominating Chair for elected positions, Vice President for conference related matters, etc.)

iii) We will institute a "Leadership Breakfast Meeting" at the conference, similar to the Mentor/Mentee Breakfast, to which all members who have indicated an interest in service can meet and speak with current EC members and officers and with Nominating Committee members to learn more about what is involved in ASTR leadership.

iv) The Administrator will, after elections, follow through with thank you letters to all those who put themselves forward to be nominated for positions, as a way of appreciating their willingness to serve even if they were ultimately not "tapped" in the current round. (The Administrator will draft thank you letters to be signed by the appropriate person, depending on the service for which the member volunteered).

2. Adjournment

MOTION: to adjourn. Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Herrera. Approved by acclamation. The meeting adjourned at 10:41 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Arons
Secretary
8 April 2011

ADDENDUM TO THE MINUTES

Record of Electronic Votes Taken, 27 February 2011 - 26 October 2011

1) MOTION: to add the following paragraph as section VII.C.8.f of the donation policy in the handbook:

"DONATIONS FOR OPERATING EXPENDITURES: The policy established above does not apply to donations expressly intended for an operating expenditure, such as an upcoming award. Donation acknowledgement (or if necessary, refusal) shall be managed through ordinary operations under the officers' general supervision."

Moved by Nellhaus, seconded Arons. Voting conducted between 4 April 2011 and 7 April 2011. Vote: 16 yes, 0 no. **The motion carried.**

2) MOTION: That ASTR sponsor a professional development workshop for faculty who mentor doctoral students, facilitated by Tracy Davis, to be held 16-17 November 2011. Moved by Nathans, seconded by Blair. Vote: 17 yes. **The motion carried.**

3) MOTION: That the Executive Committee approve the one-year contract (attached to this email) between the American Society for Theatre Research and Franklin-Sewell Communication for services provided by the ASTR Webmaster. Moved by Bennett, seconded by Blair. Voting conducted between 17 May 2011 and 20 May 2011. Vote: 17 yes. **The motion carried.**

4) MOTION: That ASTR extend sponsorship (i.e., its imprimatur) to regional events aimed at creating professional networking opportunities for ASTR members working in neighboring colleges and universities. Voting conducted between 27 May 2011 and 30 May 2011. Moved by Nathans, seconded by Blair. Vote: 16 yes. **The motion carried.**

5) MOTION: to rename the Kahan Prize the Gerald Kahan-Cambridge University Press prize and add the award of books to the value of \$250 provided by Cambridge UP to the current award. Moved by Chansky, seconded by Bennett. Voting conducted between 5 July and 8 July 2011. Vote: 5 yes, 9 no. **The motion was struck down.**

6) MOTION: ASTR will offer a third Keller award in 2011. Moved by Chansky, seconded by Blair. Voting conducted between 31 Aug 2011 and 2 Sept 2011. Vote: 16 yes. **The motion carried.**

7) MOTION: That the theme and conference planning committee (Appendix 1) be approved for the 2012 conference. Moved by Wolf, seconded by Blair. Voting conducted between 5 October and 8 October 2011. Vote: 15 yes. **The motion carried.**

Appendix 1

ASTR 2012: Theatrical Histories

Conference Directors

Patrick Anderson, University of California, San Diego

Patricia Ybarra, Brown University

Theatre is historical; history is theatrical.

These twin claims gesture to the intimate imbrication of practices that constitute theatrical production and the lived realities of social life. As a set of staged practices rich with social context, theatre seeks to document, engage, and affect the communities by and for whom it is produced. As a lineage of presence, history stages itself as monument and memorial, as genealogy of both survival and loss, as the always-shifting (always *live and present*) remembrance of things past. Theatre implicates history in its economy of representation; history implicates theatre in its economy of remembering. Theatricality and historiography are likewise linked as methodologies of negotiating the tensions between past and present; real and representational; aesthetic and scholarly practices. Meant to engage debate outside of polarizing generalizations about the field, this conference asks scholars and practitioners to re-examine "theatrical histories" in the widest possible sense at a moment of crisis in humanities scholarship within global economies of value.

Consciously broad, the 2012 conference theme is intended to encourage plenary and working group proposals from theater historians and practitioners, performance scholars and theorists, and everyone between and beyond those designations. The Program Committee invites proposals from scholars and practitioners working in any field, and on any era or form of performance history, broadly construed, whose work engages critical questions including but not limited to:

How might we think critically about contemporary and past historiographical methodologies used to write theatrical and performance histories?

How might debates among performance scholars about mediation and liveness contribute to critical historiographical practices?

How might we think about circulations of affect and modes of spectatorship in theatrical histories?

How might we resituate theorizations of the archive and the repertoire, of periodization and the past, within our research on theatrical histories?

How might the ethical implications of writing theatrical histories complicate the historiographical imperative in our current sociopolitical context?

The Conference Planning Committee is:

Co-Chairs:

Patrick Anderson (UCSD)

Patricia Ybarra (Brown)

Jayna Brown (UC Riverside)

Jonathan Chambers (Bowling Green)

Laura Edmondson (Dartmouth)

Christin Essin (Vanderbilt)

Beth Kattelman, TLA rep (OSU)

San San Kwan (UC Berkeley)

Mechele Leon (University of Kansas)

Sandra Richards (Northwestern)

Jon Rossini (UC Davis)

Lois Weaver (U London, Queen Mary)

Margaret Werry (University of Minnesota)

GSC rep (TBA)

Stacy Wolf, VP, ex officio (Princeton)