

American Society for Theatre Research Executive Committee Meeting Minutes April 16 & 17, 2015

April 16 – Meeting held in Tactic 2

- continental breakfast served from 8:30-9:00 a.m

I. 9:12 a.m. Call to order & introductions

In attendance: Daphne Lei, Amy Cook, Adam Versenyi, Noe Montez, Eric Ewald, Stephanie Vella, Cindy Brizzell-Bates, Catherine Cole, Jimmy Noriega, Chrystyna Dail, Debra Caplan, Brandi Wilkins-Catanese,

Jill cannot be here today for serious health issues. We will send her positive thoughts.

Eric: house-keeping announcements: be doing without Adrienne, Josh, Jill, Mechele, Analola, and Carol

II. Approval of agenda.

Chrystyna moved. Cindy second.

III. Approval of consent agenda

- November ABM meeting minutes
- January conference call minutes
- 2016 Election Slate

Cindy moved and Adam seconded.

IV. 9:18 a.m Officers' reports

- **President (Daphne Lei, 30 min)**
 - Communications considerations

Articulated a desire to clarify communication within organization both vertically and horizontally. How do we pass on the knowledge? Keep up momentum of passion in committees from chair to chair. And among different committees, how do we make sure they make sure to communicate? Many ad hoc committees—but how do we make sure they don't overlap and also spread the wisdom. Transparency, & clear knowledge. Take knowledge into action.

- **Vice President for Conferences**
 - ✓ Update on conference plans for Minn, 2016.
 - Muñoz WS process
 - ✓ Update on 2017 Conference
 - ✓ Discussion Items
 - Allocated AV funds at conference in relation to innovative WS programming
 - Process for integrating EC initiatives into the conference program
 - Structure of the conference and its relation to new programming initiatives
 - 2018 and 2019 Conference location selection process and considerations (not against SDHS/CORD dance conference or the American Studies Association conference)

Approved by the EC on June 6, 2016

Because Jill could not be here, I gave a brief report about her report, discussing the things that we will discuss later. Then Jimmy asked us to approve the proposed names for Program Committee, Atlanta 2017. They need 8-12.

Concern over special accommodations, whose job is it to address these concerns. Is something being done for Minn? Address issues of access at the conference. There may be expertise at ATHE from when Jill Dolan, Carrie Sandahl dealt with this. Eric: Erin might be able to deal with this because of her conference expertise.

Eric to chat with Erin about access; we agreed that accessibility should be a permanent line item. ADA is the floor we want to be up in the room. We agreed that this should probably be a permanent line item in the budget.

In terms of candidates

Jimmy: trying to represent different research areas... if we lose a name or do we want to make sure that each research area is covered? Do we have to come back every time? Do we need to make sure each area is covered?

We agreed that the EC can give approval to have a wholistic approach, to come back with the list and we can confirm then.

We agreed to the list and agreed that we would approve/vote on final list

Jill's report expressed concern with funding question, about food and a/v issues. We do need to address it. This is having an impact on people's experience coming. Erin from Ewald is amazing at getting good deals.

The conference doesn't pay for your ability to project. LCD projectors can cost upwards of \$800/day. Maybe we can hear more from Jill on the frustrations and what exactly we can do about it. It was noted that for the digitally inclined sessions, the wifi can be a problem.

➤ **9:44 Treasurer (Cindy Brizzell-Bates, 20-30 minutes)**

✓ Report on current budget status.

Small change: Banes only every other year so make it 0 for this year, and Marshall should be 2k.

Current fiscal year (June-May) We run too close to the line. Transfer from H-L didn't happen. This will be rectified this weekend when we sign the form. We still have a few expenses and incomes coming in. Our checking and savings are safe.

We came back in terms of our investments. We are doing ok, but it's been rocky. At the end of march we were up to \$758,052. Hoping we will go in the right direction. There's no reason to change anything, according to our investors.

This year projected budget: (2016-2017) Income: 236,840 and Expenses 236,430. Net income: \$410.

Income overview: Suggest a 5% increase in conf. fees. Our membership dues are lower, maybe address that. Job bank is doing well. We look at the average of last 3 years and then we take either 4 or 4.5% of that to put it into checking. Our investments are healthy so we propose doing 4.5% again.

Eric: if you are looking at straight financials that we produce, when you do a transfer from investments, it's not income. That's a balance sheet transfer, so it doesn't hit profit and loss. If you budget down to net zero, if you meet your budget, it will look like you have a 30k loss.

Cindy: we think about the investment going to awards.

Eric: they are operating funds. Build a pot big enough to sustain yourself.

Cindy: historical information about what we can transfer from investments. Proposed 5% increase in conference fees. There are some new ideas, new funding requests. We increased fees in 2013 by more than this. Our membership numbers are down so it doesn't make sense to increase those fees.

May not get funding for membership dues but they can for conf. fees. FY17 (2016 conf) \$237 for individuals, up from \$225. We decided we'd come back to this.

Approved by the EC on June 6, 2016

Expenses Admin appears to go up, conf. goes down. This is mostly about the way Nancy did accounting vs. Ewald. If you combine Admin and Conf., we are saving \$5000 because of Ewald. Awards and honoraria column: increase in \$3000. Because we increased Keller and Marshall awards. Daphne: what about the plaques?

Brandi: only book awards, distinguished scholar. That should save money.

Membership money went down too but that's also because of transfer to Ewald.

One time expenses: \$2600 for ATHE survey. And \$4550 for website redesign.

Our suggestion is to pay for these with investments.

Stephanie: where is GSC line item under?

Cindy: we may have forgotten about it.

Eric: we will look for it.

New expenses: Munoz, we agreed to fundraise for that. Money for Keller and Marshall. Additional \$2000 for conference speakers. We do need to talk about fundraising campaign.

Daphne: what about conf. speakers?

Cindy: it's been a source of contention that 4K isn't enough. Trying to get the speakers the money they need.

Catherine: this is controversial. Why are plenary speakers getting paid when others aren't?

Cindy: performances? That's what it's been most recently. But let's check in with Erin about where that's been going. And I'll check with Jill about what she's planning. Maybe she will want to use some of that for A/V or food.

Questions?

Debra: carbon offsets for conf?

Cindy: we haven't done it in a number of years. About 7 years ago. We haven't done it. Keeps falling out of budgets but we can re-initiate that.

Eric: you had \$500 in budget for that this year.

We discussed the possibility that perhaps this line item could be moved to another program. Jimmy brought up the idea of working with a theatre education organization in the area. We talked about the benefits of reaching out to such organizations, perhaps honoring them with a prize at the luncheon, etc. Daphne mentioned that there is a huge Hmong population in Minneapolis. Both ATAP and TLA were mentioned as possible assets in finding the right organization. We agreed that the carbon offset line item would be changed to Community Engagement, that we would start with \$500 the first year, and that Chyrstyna, Jimmy, Debra would take this on in collaboration with Jill and Conf Committee and that they would contact TLA and ATAP. It was also suggested that perhaps Sonja Kuftinec be a good source of information here.

We discussed conference fees.

It was mentioned that ours are low in comparison with IFTR and ATHE. It was discussed about adding a contingent fee. It was also discussed other conferences give more options for how to register. This continues to be a source of interesting dialogue: what makes someone contingent? How do we support our members who cannot afford to come? Income levels?

Daphne pointed out that according to our survey of 2014, 19% make over \$100,000. It was raised that perhaps there may be more room at the very top of income bracket: for a "lifetime membership" as ATHE offered recently at \$1500. It was agreed that we should keep membership fees the same for now but that we would continue to discuss different models for payment levels.

Break: 11:04-11:14

✓ Continue: Approval of our relationship with our investment company, Hilliard-Lyons
Two resolutions: we are continuing to do our practices with H-L and we agree to this. Motion to approve the two H-L resolutions related to our working investments

Approved by the EC on June 6, 2016

Adam: so moved. Brandi: second.

Vote: All ayes.

No: none.

Officers need to sign.

➤ **11:18: Awards and Fellowships Report (Brandi Wilkins-Catanese, 30 minutes)**

Questions: Kahan prize: language 7 years from phd, or 10 years and pre-tenure? Do we want to have a more realistic sense of the time it might take to get tenure. Any un-tenured scholar? This was discussed in terms of both the Kahan and the Brockett.

Motion to recommend to the sponsoring entities that we make these changes. Brandi to communicate with those organizations.

All in favor: aye

No nays.

No abstentions.

It has passed.

Joint authorship: do we want a policy. One person was on the very edge of each age range. The co-authors can apply for one. They decide.

Motion to include language on essay prize eligibility language: it is the responsibility of the authors to determine which prize to apply for and they can only apply for one.

Second.

All in favor: all ayes.

Abstention

No; none.

TDR: peer-reviewed? Can we consider it one of the peer-reviewed journals from which we can accept applications.

Yes

Chinoy: can we request some verification for diss status? This was discussed.

We discussed what the status should be. It was agreed that we could add a timeline to research application a timeline.

We agreed that there should be a question on the re status. Eligibility: Phd candidates who have begun working on their dissertations.

Approved.

Do we want to formally agree that you can only receive the Chinoy fellowship once?

Yes.

Move that: we revise eligibility of the award to Phd candidates who have begun working on their dissertations.” And part 2: the application materials must be revised to include a research timeline for the project. 3: we will create a form for the faculty/advisor to confirm the timeline.

4. We will change language so that you can only receive it once.

All approve: yes.

No abstentions

No nos.

So moved.

Is there any desire to allow/encourage committees to formally consider as part of their deliberations if the applicant for a given award has received prior awards/support from ASTR?

Discussion about whether it's worth addressing the sense that there is an inner circle.

Approved by the EC on June 6, 2016

Yes. We should do more to encourage people to self-nominate.

Membership: We would like to refine the language for clarity's sake by saying "The author/applicant must have been a member of ASTR for at least three of the last ___ years...etc." What period is most fair and reasonable: 7? 10? Other?

Discussion: what's the number that feels fair? We don't have the ability to verify this. A forward looking thing. Do we stand by the value that they are tied to membership, and then what number. Yes. To number one.

A good year: 5. 3/5 past years membership. To be updated.

Should we request or require that people serving on awards committees and giving out professional recognition and money on behalf of ASTR be members of the organization for the entirety of their 3-year terms? Making people maintain membership in good standing might make it harder to get people to serve?

This was discussed and it was agreed that current membership is a requirement on all of these committees. No plan b for now.

Eric: it's on the website and thus they have to update their membership.

Eric: at time of recommendation that should be part of the due diligence.

A simple directive would be that people only generate lists from the member database.

Lunch: 12:13 – 1:13

1:18 we're back

✓ Hill and Banes award: separate books from articles?

Disaggregate: book prize with money, article prize without. We don't have the money for it now, but might allow it to compete better.

Motion: is there support, pending the approval from Banes & Hill, to make a book prize and an essay prize?

Second: Stephanie

All ayes

No nos.

✓ New award for edited volumes

Development a new prize? Good use of time and energy? Money?

Motion: Prepare a proposal for a new award for edited volumes or special issues of journals by members who have been good standing.

Second: Adam

Aye

No

Abstains

It is done. Let it be so.

Brandi: so let's remove edited volumes from Banes and Hill?

Straw vote: how many people are comfortable with the fact that Banes and Hill nominations can be also nominated for Brockett and Hewitt? Yes.

Then we should leave it the way it is.

Approved by the EC on June 6, 2016

No requirement to award an essay prize, but permission to do so.

Daphne: we need to make it clear that this is because of money. And giver.

Membership: By-laws will need to be revised because it is not a part of them for EC. By-laws are very specific about who is on the program committee.

- Do we want to change by-laws to make it explicit that EC members have to be members?
Eric: it's not weird to not have it explicitly stated, it's assumed. There are some things that are overly specific. Some things are put in over time that might not need to be or should be in by-laws. Submit for possible consideration: sweeping change to by-laws.
Catherine: should address the handbook.
By-laws should be where all the key information is—and not too much more. Also required reading. And the handbook.

It was agreed that we would not change Kahan prize to include those with tenure but in the time frame; we would change Brockett: “tenure OR ten years post phd”

Agreed.

➤ **Secretary (Amy Cook 5 minutes)**

- ✓ Updates on handbook
- ✓ Very brief update. And went over handbook update. All seemed positive.
- ✓ I will be asking some of you to help me update handbook based on your experience.

➤ **3:03 Administrator's Report (Eric Ewald – 15 minutes)**

- Website update

Some things highlighted are very important: tax return, done and filed!

We are incorporated in New Jersey.

Insurance renewed.

Electronic notices and invoices. We should do 1 initial round of hard copy renewal notices. Then follow up with electronic invoicing. Hopefully narrow it down. 1 or 2 year look back on lapsed members. Go back a couple of years: who hasn't been members in many years, is there a way to pull you back in. 100-200 years who haven't upped their membership. With larger institutions, it's better to lead with paper. More in line with what had been done with CUP. Was the dip last year because of the mix of hard copy and electronic? Major source of our income.

I don't think your members leave because they don't like it. It just falls off.

Daphne: are we alienating some members if we don't send hard copies.

Communications a big deal with website redesign. Group that Emily is working with is through the design mock up. Got turned back into YourMembership, annual licensing fee we pay to them. They are turning the design around. Content population will take place then. Recent discussion: repository for archives?

Eric expressed pleasure and confidence in the relationship and the work.

➤ **2:15 Vice President for Publications (Catherine Cole, 15 minutes)**

Things going well. I am stepping down, two people cycling off: we always like people who have edited journals. If you know any one, let Catherine know.

Approved by the EC on June 6, 2016

Should the editors have a contract? Such an important part of our revenue stream. Cambridge working with Ewald to create this contract.

We've had this electronic communications person. Rye Gentleman, input on website. All reports together.

We are healthy.

➤ **2:20 Graduate Student Caucus Report (Stephanie Vella, 15 minutes)**

Things going well. Peer mentorship and networking added new event. Really successful, way more people than we expected. To give first time grad students a chance to meet folks. Opening reception is recipe for a panic attack. Give people a chance to network before that. We are going to expand this for this next

Conf. committee working together to put packet for conference.

We are talking to Paige and Gad about organizing GSC Career session.

➤ **2:25 Discussion about communication between committees (Daphne Lei, 15 minutes)**

- ✓ Clear charges for committees: how to archive the information collected to facilitate transitions?
- ✓ Should there be a "sunset clause" for all ad hoc committees?
- ✓ Should there be a quarterly quick chat among the committees to see what they've been working on?

How do we capture knowledge? Because we are doing new committees, it's a good time to discuss. For example: new paradigms: what happened with that? Where is that information? Don't want to do extra work.

Website as a library. Dropbox or folder for each committee. Members only. Way to keep the knowledge. Can go back a bit longer.

Adam: is there a charge for committees to report that? By a particular time. I'm thinking in particular as liaison with ATAP, simple matter for the minutes of our monthly meeting to be passed on or put into a folder. Shouldn't be too difficult to capture that.

Catherine: two layers: all the energy that goes into problem framing and execution, maybe we aren't as good at execution. Structural issues around turnover and then also a question of archive. Some sensitivity about what information gets passed down through the ages. The reports are good as a way to monitor one's own progress.

Chrystyna: hasn't been an expectation of record keeping. No one expected it of them. The information. Perhaps we can put a call out to the membership, if you have information about your work in a committee, please send to a particular person.

Catherine: can we do that with our website?

Eric: yes.

Catherine: that's what we should do. You deselect who has access. And we can give out varying levels of access. You can see everything but no edit, master privileges.

Daphne: good place to start.

Eric: it's an education process. It's what Shaun wanted all the WG to use. As an organization, we use our website.

Catherine: if we wanted to make it a requirement to use this platform, is there an onboarding process?

Eric: a bit. It's pretty intuitive. We have instructions, videos, written instructions.

Cindy: some of the working groups are using this.

Dpahen: emails too?

Eric: yes. You are in a much better position to mandate the use of this when it comes to committees. It's a great tool and being used by thousands of organizations.

Catherine: any potential down side?

Amy: too much information is useless.

Daphne: store crucial info but not all.

Eric: room where people meet and share documents. Nothing gets gummed.

AC volunteers to help.

Eric: you, me and Emily to start to discuss how committees work. Bridge a little bit with Emily.

We discussed when and how the committees should be in contact, whether on the phone or at the conference. Perhaps committee chairs can meet at conference with ASTR Staff (previously known as Ewald") to discuss budget, best practices, etc.

Eric: Committee chair: about governance. Do people have misunderstanding about what ASTR's budget is? This is your organization. This is how it works. This is how you can serve, this is your staff. (Ewald should be considered ASTR staff, not Ewald)

Permanent, standing, and ad hoc committees. Meeting at conference.

BREAK 2:53—3:03

➤ **Ad Hoc Committee on Membership (Noe Montez, 45 minutes)**

- ✓ Collection of member demographics

Noe: only functioning since early March. 1) assess state of current membership 2) visibility of concerns 3) strategies for expanding membership

Looking to get volunteers for the committee.

In re: 2016 conf. explicitly: Tell me booth. Ginny Anderson, co-chair. Creating an increased sense of transparency. That concerns raised are doing something. Articulate the concerns at the end of conference? We'd like to see the tell me booth being populated by the membership committee. More people the better. We are mindful that people don't know what the tell me booth is. Might it be possible to have a paragraph in the program booklet about the tell me booth. Acknowledge in the president's note or in opening remarks. Hope to tweet about the tell me booth. Person A will be at the Tell me booth for the next hour, come talk. Ultimately it would be nice to have it in a less public place but space is very tight but maybe next time.

Approved by the EC on June 6, 2016

We discussed ways to make use of the information gathered through the Tell Me Booth: a play, part of President's address, or State of the Profession.

Noe: we are writing a 1 minute survey that would give a sense of the organization. Google form with an "I decline to answer" option.

We discussed what questions needed to be asked and how. It was requested that we ask How many of our members are MA vs. MFAs vs. phd.? Do they come from public R1, liberal arts, etc.? We agreed we should ask about income level, even of grad students.

Daphne: quantitative survey later. We need basic knowledge of who we are. I brought in UCI's demographic survey the categories they use for gender and race/ethnicity. We talk about diversity without knowing the information.

Noe: we may do a fuller survey in the future.

We discussed the pros and cons to open ended questions on race and gender. And agreed that what we gained out-weighed the (apparently) minimal challenges of collating/categorizing that information.

We agreed to include a question about disability.

Noe: people can decline to answer any and all questions.

Daphne: as long as we can collect the information and use the information.

Noe: we can adjust in 2017, we can.

June is date for when the renewal information. Do we want it to go out in hard copy too?

Eric: survey monkey will not allow you to fill it out twice. Invite them via the hardcopy to fill out the survey. Then in email reminders, just keep inviting people to do it.

Noe: to get questions by the beginning of June.

➤ **Ad Hoc Committee on Mentorship (Daphne Lei, 15 minutes)**

Robin can't get to it so I don't have much to report. I think this is really important and happens in many ways. What should we do with a committee that's dormant. Looking for new members.

VII. 4:00 Some future visions

- Newsletter (not to members but to outside)
We don't have one. Could be easy? We agreed that this would be part of the Membership Committee's charge.

4:06: 60 Year-Old ASTR

- ✓ Reposition ourselves: new image, direction, community?
- ✓ More diverse, more transparent communication, and more transnational.
- ✓ Better community-building
- ✓ Sustaining community through both traditional ways and modern technology.

Daphne pointed out that 60 is a big deal: Different way to think about time: 12 animals and 5 elements. Everything starts anew at 60. Huge celebration, a new beginning. Theme of the conference is Trans can we think about transformation.

Approved by the EC on June 6, 2016

transnational? We discussed thinking about international scholarship for Atlanta, since it is a hub. We discussed this as a possible growth area, as ASTR has much to offer the international community.

Catherine: Joint conference with CORD was really successful. Maybe do that again.

Jimmy: How do we address the UGs? Wonder what it would mean to reach out to UGs? Undergrads from under-represented communities. Is it something worth considering for a future vision? I work at an UG institution and I have a lot who go into grad school. Also my institution would support them. UG panel? Show off to our home institution.

It was agreed that this was something to pursue. Reaching out to local universities and colleges in the conference locale to find UGs who might be interested in attending. Perhaps the relationship could lead to a faculty building ASTR into their syllabus. Kate Brideson's name came up. It was suggested that we have a grad student rep on the Community Engagement committee who might be able to help with this. We discussed a Working Group on UG research for the Atlanta conference, perhaps as part of mentorship committee, maybe a new form, like posters or shorter papers.

*This should be brought up in conversation with Jill.

This can then be added to the WG plan for Atlanta.

4:53 Close. Dinner on your own.

SUNDAY

8:30-9:00 – Breakfast in Tactic 2

(please check out prior to breakfast)

9:05 meeting called to order.

Budget for approval (Cindy)

Found the GSC line for 1100

We are changing the offset line to Community Engagement Line

Contingent Faculty Rate (suggested # but we can crunch)

Go ahead with 5% increase in other reg categories.

Added a line item for the Munoz awards, even though we hope to raise the money

Royalties line: we vastly underbudgeted what we are getting from *Theatre Survey* (we are getting \$26000) so we popped up our expectation to \$16000 and maybe next year move it up to \$20000

So we added \$2500 to A/V in Conf. and food and bev to \$5200

Didn't take out the plaques. But we can adjust that number next year.

Motion: to approve the 2016/17 budget

Adam Seconded

Approve: all ayes.

Abstain: no

Nos: no.

So moved.

9:12 Fundraising.

✓ Sponsorship/fundraising--should we think about it as conference based or Society based?

Local business? Sustainable long-term strategy? We are so good at dreaming things we need money to make things happen. How do we make ourselves feel like we aren't just selling our souls? (For whom are we an asset?)

Sponsorship for the conference and more targeted sponsorship, like for the Munoz or a Community Engagement award.

Daphne: Robin knows the mayor of Minneapolis maybe approach them but get their blessing then that attracts local business. 1 suggestion: start with the mayor. Invite her to come, thinking about empowerment, say a few words.

We discussed the value of getting a book company to sponsor the opening reception. We agreed we would approach Cambridge UP.

Adam said he would approach The Guthrie

Chyrstyna pointed out that Minn has a Women's Council—perhaps they could sponsor an event? If we do an Empowerment event?

It was clear that this might not be the way to start for this coming year; Daphne reminded us of the proposed Smart Start project that we might be able to coordinate for Atlanta. Smart start is a workshop given by AAUW how to negotiate for women. We know women are screwed. It's \$1000

Eric: You have such a fun group of people. Given the theme. Not too far from the hotel is a really cool Emporium. Approach The Emporium for free drink tickets. Crazy dance party at Gay 90s. Fun way to throw an easy party. It's close, right around the corner. It's an institution.

We agreed that Eric should approach The Emporium with the idea and that the Conference Committee would have latitude to try stuff and report back. Although we discussed some of the risks, we felt that working with local businesses, as an experiment, was a good way to start.

Guthrie ** Adam to contact

Gay90s **Eric

And the Mayor -- Women's org **Robin knows. Daphne to speak with Robin

Cambridge UP **Maybe start with Conf planning committee.

9:53 Webinar

We talked about a number of options: teaser videos before the conference, live-streaming (which can be expensive and unreliable) the President's address/State of the Profession, a 50-60 webinar outside of the conference on new research—say the results of the adjunct survey. (this last would cost about \$600-800 to do members only webinar).

We agreed that there were many potential ways to incorporate this (short presentations throughout the year, member news, international involvement, extension of career sessions) and many advantages (one more reason for someone to not drop their membership). Perhaps Conf Planners should consider taping few plenary speakers talking for a minute or two about their paper as a teaser. Might be a good idea to talk with Conf. Planners about what lead them to produce this as the prompt? What was the process that culminated in that? In the future, being able to produce that earlier might be helpful to those who want to apply?

Daphne: can you give us a general sense of how much it would cost, Eric?

Eric: depends on how you want to deliver it. Is it a video you send a link to? Cost of the recording. If it's live, it will be \$600-800. Video thing it could be next to nothing. Possible in kind: maybe there's someone at the local university to record some things in exchange for conf fee. Interviews with award winners put on a youtube channel.

Approved by the EC on June 6, 2016

Stephanie: GSC web committee can help.

Agreed it would make sense to film the two sessions at this coming conference (state of profession and President's address) and also have that short conversation with the next conf. planners for the coming conf. is this possible.

Cindy will reach out to those who aren't here to see if we can get some volunteers. Steph will put Cindy in touch with GSC people?

11:00 – 11:30 Summarize Action Items and discuss next meeting(s)

10:45:

AC summed up what we've discussed and action items

We discussed adding a button to fundraise for the Jose Munoz award maybe creating a flyer/brochure to raise money for it.

Brandi: Theatre dept.s in or near university; will email AC to include in notes. *See below

Jimmy: accessibility. Maybe we need an ad hoc committee. Someone dedicated to be that person who can be that person.

Daphne: I will talk to Catherine who can be on the committee

Brandi: I will volunteer.

Jimmy: quickly solidify 2018 conf.?

Daphne: we are still waiting for quotes for the hotel. I'm proposing Santa Monica. Close to LA, transnational. A lot of UC people attending. Weather amazing. Walking. Also both Getty Museum & Getty Villa are there. Getty Villa is very close. People will have places to stay. How expensive? Oakland, San Diego, Denver,

Eric: Erin checked in. she's getting an RFP sent out. Next week or week after. We can get rid of some really fast.

Daphne: 60th birthday. Heather found some articles about 25th and 50th anniversary. Display table. Including the past presidents, part of next Theatre Survey or part of state of the profession.

Stephanie: Kellen did a lot of institutional research last year. We have that. We started in 2005/2006.

Daphne: display for GSC as well.

The 50th in Chicago. It might have been published in TS.

Eric: what happened in 1956?

Brandi: interrogate the A, the S, the T, the R

Chrystyna: how many living presidents? Might be interesting to have a retrospective of presidents.

AC: Give \$60 if you are over 60 for the 60th.

Chrystyna: honor those who have been a member the longest, give the amount you have been a member.

Brandi: activate people's loyalty in relationship to their time here. A modest ask. Publish an honor role. Publish a list of people who made a gift in honor the time they've been in the organization.

Stephanie: tie to something? "Give back to the future"

Debra: you can give them a list of where they want to give. Different initiatives.

Daphne: approaching a person who has done the work for a long time for a new award

Brandi: What was your first time? Length of time they've been associated?

Brandi: put it on the website, tweet it #myfirstastr

Approved by the EC on June 6, 2016

Debra: nice for new members to see. #astrmemories

Eric: twitter wall at the conference?

Brandi: can become negative.

Chrystyna: not everyone tweets, we'd invite other kinds

Debra: but we could collect information and then tweet it out.

Daphne: if an email goes out from me, will that reach everyone?

Debra: social media response.

Stephanie: it's accumulative.

AC: promotion back to university

Jimmy: maybe we should consider a FB page.

Debra: challenge is who does that. Someone needs to maintain it, designate someone to do it, moderate, respond. If it's something we want to do, we need to think about how that's going to work.

Daphne: what about the electronic publication? Could you work with them, Debra?

Debra: to follow up about this. Assuming we all agree that this is something we want to do.

Noe: we need to do a Twitter feed.

Debra will follow up with Twitter as well.

Eric: slack channel. Collaborative communitive tool. Archiving. Group texting. You should check it out.

Daphne: letter to everyone contribute based on their interaction.

Daphne: put together a powerpoint of photos of old memories.

This button will not be on membership renewal.

Doodle poll to follow up and do a conf call with Jill.

Any other thoughts? Your vision, fundraising.

We adjourn. Jimmy second.

Closed. 11:31

Approved by the EC on June 6, 2016

From Brandi:

Document listing the schools in Minneapolis. Noting that the chairs in many of the departments are MFAs, so I also noted any PhD-holding faculty. I think it would be wise to send to both the chair and the PhD faculty in the departments, so that the PhD faculty doesn't have to relay the message of invitation to the chair.

Theater Departments in or near Minneapolis:

Augsburg College

Chair: Darcy Engen (MFA): engen@augsb.org; Assoc. Professor: Sarah Myers (PhD) myerss@augsb.org

Bethel University—Christian college, very practice-focused

Chair: Meg Zauner (ABD PhD from UMN): mzauner@bethel.edu

Carleton College

Chair: Judith Howard (MFA; on leave fall 2016): jhoward@carleton.edu; Professor: Roger Bechtel (PhD): rbechtel@carleton.edu

Gustavus Adolphus—Lutheran and Swedish

Chair: Micah Maatman (MFA): mmaatman@gustavus.edu; Associate Professor Henry MacCarthy (PhD): hmaccart@gustavus.edu; Professor Amy Seham (PhD): aseham@gustavus.edu

Hamline University

Chair: William Wallace (MFA): bwallace@hamline.edu; Professor Jeff Turner (PhD): jturner@hamline.edu

Macalester College

Chair: Harry Waters, Jr. (MFA): waters@macalester.edu; Assoc. Professor Beth Cleary (PhD): cleary@macalester.edu; VAP Malin Palani (PhD): mpalani@macalester.edu

St. Catherine's University—Catholic institution, no theater department!

St. Olaf College

Chair: Brian Bjorklund (MFA) bjorklund@stolaf.edu; Assoc. Professor William Sonnega (PhD): sonnega@stolaf.edu; Asst. Prof. Jeanne Willcoxon (PhD): willcoxo@stolaf.edu; Professor Karen Peterson Wilson (PhD): wilsonk@stolaf.edu

University of Minnesota Twin Cities

Chair: Marcus Dilliard (MFA): dilli008@umn.edu; Associate Chair, Sonja Kuflinec (PhD): kufli001@umn.edu; Margaret Werry (former conference program chair): werry001@umn.edu