

**American Society for Theatre Research
Executive Committee Spring Meeting
April 21-22, 2018**

MINUTES

Saturday, April 21

8:30am Call to order (8:40)

- Present:
 - Daphne Lei (President), Jill Stevenson (VP for Conferences), Patricia Herrera (VP for Awards), Esther Kim Lee (VP for Publications), EJ Westlake (Treasurer), Scott Magelssen (Secretary), Elizabeth Son, Sissi Liu, Rhonda Blair, Doug Jones, Debra Caplan, James Harding, Noe Montez, Kate Bredeson.
- Present by Phone:
 - Chrystyna Dail
- Absent:
 - Rosemary Malague

- Introductions
- Motion to approve consent agenda (meeting agenda, November EC meeting minutes, mid-winter conference call minutes, and 2018 election slate) for Spring EC Meeting. Motion seconded.
 - Friendly amendment to move the approval of handbook revisions from Secretary's report this morning to Sunday Morning to 1) give EC members more time to go over revisions and 2) to include additional awards language that may come out of conversations today.
- Motion carries.

8:40am Officers' reports

1. 8:44 President (Daphne Lei, 15 minutes)

- This is a slower-paced meeting than the one in November so that we can spend more time reflecting back and looking forward.
- Daphne's goals have been Diversity and Transnational connections and building our Graduate Student base.
- We're working on staff issues with Ewald. We want a really great relationship with Ewald. When we work it's wonderful, but this doesn't always happen. Officers will meet with Eric early tomorrow morning.

2. 8:48 Vice President for Conferences (Jill Stevenson, 30 minutes)

- Online submissions have been good in some regards, but a monster in others.
- We've had increases in membership
- We've had good success with the Field Conversations.

- Jill asks for EC members to think about and give recommendations for destination cities for conferences after 2020.

a. Vetting and Approval of Conference Theme 2019

- i. Theatre and Its Many Publics.
- ii. Rhonda moves acceptance of theme. Noe Seconds.
- iii. Discussion. There was a conversation about making sure the program committee had more diversity with regard to type of institution (not just R1 representatives.)
- iv. Motion carries.

b. Changing “Career Sessions” to “Field Conversations” in Handbook

- i. Jill Moves, Kate seconds
- ii. Motion Carries

c. Resolution to change the Program Committee membership to include only one representative from the Committee on Conferences.

- i. Jill It’s difficult to find people to fill two roles, and it also adds more folks who haven’t been on board and invested from the beginning.
- ii. This would be a bylaw change and needs approval from general membership. We need to discuss it in November, and then we need to submit the new bylaws language to membership in email ballot and get 2/3 vote of individual membership in good standing.
- iii. Jill will add this to the agenda for November.
- iv. Scott will send the amended language out to the membership one month before the November meeting. NOTE TO SCOTT TO DO THIS
- v. Eric adds that ASTR Bylaws have some pretty old language and could stand to be updated. We should change amendment process so it doesn’t take up to a year to make a change.

d. Categories for membership.

- i. Discussion: Can we put contingent faculty members and independent scholar in the same category? Or add independent scholar/artist at same rate as that of contingent faculty member? Should we make contingent faculty fee closer to student fee because they actually probably get fewer funding resources than students?
- ii. Let’s change the names of the categories for now, and then keep the numbers in conversation for November. What are the budget implications for changing the fees?
- iii. Daphne: 10% of 684 people are contingent/independent
- iv. Rhonda: Many retired scholars can afford to pay more. This would help address the more financially precarious position of the younger/emerging folks.
- v. Jill, can Ewald and EJ model out a number of different options?
- vi. Doug: MLA goes by sliding scale salary. So people full-time tenured pay twice as much as non-tenured contingent. Jill: this makes for a much harder way to budget, but worth looking at.
- vii. Debra: let’s look at other organizations and ask what works for them. Because a full time tenured prof at a community college could make a lot less than one at an R1

- viii. Scott: it's not about getting it perfect, but about sending a message that we are mindful of this.
- ix. Eric: Chase Bringardner is interested in dropping categories from ATHE. And we will be just fine even if we get the fee structure wrong and see a 25% drop in dues revenue. We've got plenty in the bank.
- e. **New budget lines/funding requests:**
 - i. **Permanent line for Field Conversations session leaders' box lunches**
 - 1. Jill: it's such a small thing, and the people are so grateful.
 - ii. **New line for Field Conversations box lunches for graduate students**
 - 1. The idea is that all who sign up for Field Conversations get a free box lunch. Are there commitments we could make like this that show we support the membership?
 - 2. Rhonda. Maybe we're talking about minimizing expenses for people with fewer resources, so we might be thinking about giving them either a reduced conference fee *or* a free lunch. Jill: the box lunches cost \$25. What we charge members for lunch with registration already doesn't cover the lunch cost. We eat the money.
 - iii. **Money for a conference app**
 - 1. Jill: this is something that would allow people in working sessions to upload documents and share them before hand. Especially since a lot of sessions don't have AV in the rooms.
 - 2. A new App called Social Link is a year-round app. \$750 per year. Conference attendees can connect to the app to get shared files, etc. Not as robust as eventmoji, which is a big scheduling/calendar app. But this is more about sharing than scheduling.
 - 3. James: what's the difference between this and Dropbox? Jill: we don't know. Maybe more functionality and year round integrated with website.
 - 4. Eric: would this get out of the idea of individual conference apps each year? We would just have one app year round?
 - 5. Chrystyna says for the working group she organized last year she programmed their own website and it was password protected. Her concern is that the shared scholarly material would be available year-round without being protected. Jill: we'll look into this.
 - 6. Rhonda: we are awash with new apps. Let's make sure we're not doubling up.
 - 7. We will gather the information and then discuss it at the next teleconference before we move forward.

3. 9:25 Treasurer (E.J. Westlake, 30 minutes)

- **Good news and bad news**
 - Good news: our portfolio is doing incredibly well. See report.
 - Bad news: West Coast conferences like the upcoming one in San Diego have had historically lower attendance than those in East and in Midwest hubs. Portland was a low point for us. San Diego will be better, but we should plan ahead. We are looking at a budget deficit. How much of a deficit are we willing to run?

- We ran a simulation using slightly rosier numbers than those from Portland. We would still come out low, conservatively estimating:
 - With Jill's funding requests added in, we run a \$21,000 deficit, and event without requests have \$9,000 deficit.
 - The stock market is crazy and upward swinging, but this cannot last forever.
- James asks about the budget expenditures. EJ: awards, administration, conference costs. Food and beverage. Program books. Jill adds: accessibility line (ESL interpreters, etc.)
- Scott: what if we move to an app that has file sharing and an electronic program book and get rid of AV and printing costs
- James: people will be angry, but it will be generational. And worth doing.
- Rhonda: will this app affect our relationship with hotels? Eric: no.
- Jill: if we move to non-print programs, we'll need a lot of pre-conference and conference weekend support for people who don't know how to use the app.
- Debra: there are a lot of angles to think through. What can we support beyond just files?
- Discussion: What if audience is all looking at their phones instead of the plenary speakers? EJ: I've always tried to work around AV by providing QR codes to get them to the page she wants to share. It's about helping people. Rhonda: cognitive research supports the idea that we lose focus and community when screens are introduced. Debra: at plenaries it's just one thing happening. As soon as you have a million things in front of everyone, it changes. Hotel AV contracts do not allow us to provide our own projectors.
 - James: we could make the move to non-print and file-sharing right away and save the costs and get all anger right away, and then people will get used to it sooner. And we'll keep costs down starting now.
 - Jill we need a buffer to protect people from getting screamed at. It is not just a little bit of a rough patch. It's crying and screaming. It's very personal for people. Think about the vegetarian meal change.
 - Kate: audio visual is what we do as performance scholars. What we see on the screen is part of the event. Especially for the luncheon: it's a big deal to see your name up on the screen. To cut screens is anathema to what we do.
 - Doug: what's the budget for AV? EJ \$30,000.
 - Doug: it makes so much sense to cut printed programs. People can print it at home. Or pay a fee to buy a printed program.
- Kate: we use Wells Fargo. Should we move away from this? EJ: we will look into using a more responsible venue.

4. 9:55 Vice President for Publications (Esther Kim Lee, 20 minutes)

- a. Nothing but good news:
 - i. We have a star-studded publications committee.
 - ii. The journal is making a lot of money for us right now.

- iii. Nick Ridout is excited about changing format to make it sexier. Maybe changing the name on the cover to *TS*.
- b. Request (From Erika Lin) for summer funding for Book Review Editor RA (\$1600)
 - i. There is a good rationale for this. Our contribution to the journal has not increased even as the number of issues per year has gone up.
 - ii. Discussion:
 - 1. Are we thinking about this just for CUNY, or for all book review editors? (a permanently funded RA line would make it more attractive to potential book review editors. Those who aren't currently at institutions with grad programs or grad student support could be book review editor).
 - 2. We're getting a lot of money from journal.
 - 3. Scott: can there be labor sharing with editor in chief? Esther: no. It's largely detached.
 - 4. Esther: maybe we can try this for a trial couple of years?
 - iii. Jill moves that we put this \$1600 in the budget for two years. Rhonda seconds.
 - iv. EJ requests that we table the vote and put it in the budget discussion tomorrow morning. Tabled.
 - v. We're not sure whether all members are happy about the blogging on the ASTR website. There is a lack of transparency about who was selected to blog. So we should think about the politics when we think about additions to electronic resources for Theatre Survey.
 - vi. Doug asks about rationale for name change. He's not sure that *TS* is a good move. Noe: the EC should have a chance to weigh in.
 - 1. Esther: Nick feels that *TS* reflects what's happening in the conference doesn't reflect what's happening in the journal.
 - 2. James: the editor has autonomy about the content. The publications committee should make the recommendation and the EC should approve it.

10:15am Break

10:25am Continue reports

5. 10:25 Awards and Fellowships Report (Patricia Herrera, 30 minutes)

- Patricia fills us in on updates to filling committees: Angela Marino on Brockett. Tara Rodman on Chinoy. We're looking for third committee members for three more committees: Targeted research fellowship, collaborative research grants, grants for researchers for heavy teaching loads.
 - Scott: can past awardees be asked to serve? Noe: This makes sense. We do it with other awards. Daphne. Yes. Sometimes they say no.
- Patricia: we don't have regular language for the date range for which essays and books need to be published to be eligible for our awards. We don't clarify whether the dates refer to the dates when books and essays are published vs. when they're released. The book's copyright date doesn't always match the release

date. Instead of putting the burden on the chairs to decide this in individual cases, we need language to help the chairs decide.

- Patricia moves: For journal article submissions, the date of the article's release (e.g., January 2019) takes precedence over the year of the journal issue (e.g., Volume 3 Issue 4, Winter 2018). For books, the release date (e.g., October 2018) takes precedence over the copyright date (e.g., 2019).
 - James adds: it's about people having a fair shot of being considered. At the date that's listed for the journal it's the journal year.
 - There is discussion about whether people would get left out. Answer: no.
- Patricia: there is a name inconsistency between Targeted Research Grant vs. Targeted Research Fellowship.
- Scott: we will change the word "Fellowship" to "Grant" throughout handbook and on the website.
- Elizabeth has a question about the deadline change for dissertation fellowship for much later than before (July vs. April). Eric and Jill: we changed these to bring them more into alignment to each other.
- Elizabeth: maybe the grad student award should be moved earlier so they knew what they were doing for the summer. Patricia: we do it later so students have time to propose. And we work on fast turnaround to still give them word very quickly.

6. 10:55 Secretary (Scott Magelssen 5 minutes)

- a. Approval of updates to the handbook moved to tomorrow morning.

7. 11:00 Administrator's Report (Eric Ewald – 30 minutes)

a. Listserv issues

- i. Eric: Should we move the ASTR listserv from University of Illinois to Ewald server? The Illinois server is a legacy of Nancy who maintained success and efficiency by doling out jobs to third parties. There is nothing acute in terms of problems, but we really don't have a lot of control over the listserv now. As far as branding and ownership, there's more to be desired. Right now, any rules we want to enforce would have to be negotiated with U of Illinois. It's a very basic listserv. It's old school
- ii. Eric: We don't even really know who to contact with questions. Esther: It was created by Peter Davis.
- iii. Esther: I think we should remain open to more than just members
- iv. James: maybe pass the ASTR listserv over to University of Maryland to match up with that institution maintaining our archive? Maybe this gives both a boost and does something for the organization and its ability to archive.
- v. Discussion: Esther: what is the listserv for? Scott: lots of folks don't renew membership every year, and rely on the listserv for resources.
- vi. Scott: let's table the archive conversation for later in the meeting.
- vii. Eric, the listserv generally hasn't had a problem with behavior of users, whether inappropriate content or self-promotion.

b. Admin report:

- i. Eric: We are working through changes. We are very happy with the team we're working with now: Christy, Arzu, Mei Li.

ii. Website

1. Scott: The website is now updated with content from ASTR Annual Meetign 2017, but we talked earlier about changing the layout of the landing page. Daphne: we could use the space on that page a little better.
2. Eric: we can make these changes. Scott will schedule a phone call with Mei Li and the officers.
3. Esther: can there be administrative access to outside users for updating the content on pages, like the list of books on our publications pages? For *Theatre Survey*, content like this changes frequently. Would it be possible for *Theatre Survey* folks to have access to this page for more efficient content change?
4. Eric. Ultimately the answer is yes. The more complicated answer is we need to find out whether access would have unintended consequences, or allow more room for messing up design and formatting or unintended access to private data.

8. 11:30 Graduate Student Caucus Report (Sissi Liu, 15 minutes)

- a. We have a new position: Inclusion officer. This is in response to Trump's policy regarding international people coming into the US.
- b. This past conference in Atlanta was the best attended by graduate students.
- c. The Field Conversation panels included 30-minute mock interviews that matched each student with at least two faculty volunteers.
- d. Can we include the possibility of the inclusion officer serving on one of the ASTR standing committees? Duties include overseeing disability assistance, coordinating gender identity buttons, etc.
- e. Can we think about making mock interviews an ASTR event, maybe a sister event to the mentorship breakfast, instead of just having it be part of the Field Conversations?
- f. Regarding Mentorship: we want to continue to improve matching up mentor-mentee relationships.
- g. Conference assistance: we would like to digitize the packets and disseminate these to graduate students online. This is part of a move away from printing.
- h. We would like to have GSC social media links on the ASTR website. The dialogue is robust on social media right now. NOTE TO SCOTT: BRING THIS UP WITH EWALD
- i. We would like to update our listserv. The GSC listserv is two years old. NOTE TO SCOTT: FOR EWALD
- j. Thank you for the work-study fellowship program. All the fellowships, however, were filled in just two days and they only served 5 percent of the graduate students at the conference.
 - i. Maybe instead of 15 fellowships for 100 dollars, we can do 30 fellowships for \$50 a piece, so we can have double the amount of graduate students benefit from a fellowship at the same cost to the organization.
 - ii. Daphne: having more fellows would be helpful to me. Especially if we move some of the receptions into the Presidential Suite.
- k. Jill: is there a way to make the inclusion an even bigger part of the organization's mission? Sissi: the accessibility issues are explicit and implicit. For instance,

many of the sessions dealing with minority issues were scheduled at the same time as each other.

- l. Noe: 40% of last year's conference attendance was grad students. Is this typical? If this spike continues to exist, the organization needs to acknowledge what's needed to support this bigger part of the demographic.
- m. Noe to Sissi: say more about the mock interviews moving away from the Field Conversations. What's involved and what's the rationale for hosting these in a different venue? Sissi: it shifts labor away from Field Conversations to Mentorship. Last year we did the interviews during conference breaks and organized it two days ahead of time.
 - i. Debra: so glad this has gone well. I also wonder is there an interest among GSC membership for mock skype interviews and mock phone interviews?
 - ii. Kate: we can also talk about different institutions (Research 1, private liberal arts schools, etc.) doing interviews in different ways.
 - iii. Chrystyna: ATDS has been doing this for some time that people can sign up for. It's been easy to do and is happening with other societies.
- n. Jill: So the mentorship breakfast will stay intact, but the Field Conversations would be part of Mentorship? Sissi: yes.
- o. Debra: would the mock interviews happen at the mentorship breakfast? It's gotten to be a big and loud space. Sissi: we'll do it in other rooms. And we are working on including Skype.
- p. Doug: do we have space for 30 graduate student work-study fellows?
 - i. Eric: We mostly use these students for registration. They do an orientation. We're well provisioned with help. We might not have need or room for adding more. But, assigning them to Daphne for the party to take photos, buy drinks, get ice, might be a good idea. Jill: they can help with presenters getting set up with their AV. Eric: They can help with social media.
 - ii. Doug: I can imagine 10 but maybe not 15, two assigned to each VP.
 - iii. Doug: we should not drop the amount of compensation but increase it across the board.
 - iv. Scott: we could use 15 more fellows to help folks with the conference app if we move to a conference app.
- q. Daphne: who is going to manage the Fellowships? How many we need? Who makes the decisions, administrates the fellowships? Jill: If we add fifteen more, Daphne gets 2 and Jill gets 13 to help with AV.
- r. Scott: we can include links to social media on the website, and include this in conversation with Mei Li. Eric: we just need to make sure there is cohesion and differentiation between the ASTR material and the social media material.

9. 11:45 Committee open issues

- a. Daphne: There have been hiccups with nominating committee. We have an election slate now, but it was late. A similar issue happened last year.
- b. Jill: for the last two years, we haven't elected the number of people we need to elect. Also, we elected too few EC members last year. There hasn't been proper onboarding of the nominating committee leadership. They may be waiting to hear from us before they start their work.

- c. Jill: maybe the nominating committee needs a bit more direction in terms of what we're looking for in an election slate. More clarity in process, in calendar, and more guidance in best practices as they develop the slate.
- d. Daphne: also there are more frequent difficulties in finding enough people willing to run for a position.
- e. James: are these procedures in the handbook? Daphne: the position descriptions are in there, but not necessarily the best practices language, troubleshooting, etc. Jill: it's also knowing about the conversations that are happening now. What are the priorities, the skills, etc., needed in leadership? That stuff that isn't going to be in the handbook.
 - i. Jill: we also do have guidelines, but the handbook hasn't been followed. Like a call for nominations didn't ever go out.
- f. James: we also need to have a conversation about the slate. Some of the names on here are surprising. We haven't seen these people in other committees before.
- g. Doug: has there ever been a situation where someone serves as VP first and then President? Jill: no, but we have staggered terms for mentorship.
- h. Jill: while there are some resume experiences we look for, there are also skill sets that people can bring to the role.

LUNCH BREAK 12:00-1:15

1:15 Post Lunch business from the floor

- Jill: motion to reopen discussion of election slate. EJ. Seconds
- Motion carries
- Discussion
 - Esther: the nominations committee did not follow the handbook. Only four people were on the committee, vs. five. The open call for nominations never went out to the membership.
 - Jill: clearly we didn't have the amount of oversight that we should have had.
 - Esther: if we did not follow procedure, is the slate valid?
 - James: the charge of the nominating committee is not as clear as it should be. We are setting ourselves up to be challenged. We don't serve our organization well where we ask people to do work and then go after them when they don't do it.
 - Rhonda: Bylaws X.2 says we should put the ballot before the membership eight months before the November meeting. We're out of compliance.
 - Jill: we need to do bylaw training and calendar training.
 - Esther: maybe we should have a big Google calendar
 - James: in the statement that Rhonda read (Bylaws X.2), there was a part that said additional candidates can be added by petition. Our elections tend to give the appearance of anointing people. The situation at present doesn't help. The enduring image of anointing people won't go away until we make the moves to show we are being more democratic and more transparent.
- Jill: motion to delay the general vote to allow members to nominate additional candidates per Article VIII section 2. In the coming six months the EC will revise the nominating committee's process. EJ seconds.
 - James speaks in favor of the motion as it has been articulated.
 - The slate will be sent out by the nominating committee through Ewald with a call for additional nominations.

- Rhonda: let the nominating committee know in advance. And the people on the slate, too.
- Jill: and a general email out to all of them thanking them for their willingness to stand.
- Motion carries.
 - James: should there be a taskforce for changing the nominating committee? If so I'm happy to be on it. Debra says she would be too.
- Eric: I suggest once this is revised, an attorney should look through it. This isn't ten thousand dollars. Not one thousand either, but not hugely expensive.
- James: right now the EC is very generally described in the bylaws. This should be addressed.
- Eric: another clause that's not in there is a clause for removal.
- Eric: how should the bylaws be best phrased to make it work for the organization and then are these in compliance within the state of New Jersey.

1:52 p.m. President's discussion: Looking Back and Looking Forward

a. Looking back

1. Muñoz

- a. I was there when the Muñoz was created. And when it was launched, Jorge Huerta said "I know José would be smiling in heaven." Doug will talk a bit about the next two years.
 - i. Doug: My co-conveners and I met four or five times, at ASTR, and at Indiana University.
 - ii. The group is diverse and intergenerational. We submitted an edited collection of 150,000 words. Contributors include five graduate students/junior faculty, lots of rising associates.
 - iii. This year we're doing a mentoring group. Senior scholars will work with junior scholars to write book proposals and grants.
 - iv. We've raised about \$40,000 from their institutions. The Muñoz money is seed money that helps them solicit more funding (sends the message that there is an imprimatur, oversight, etc.). It opens up a lot more money.
 - v. We've pulled in people who didn't really know about ASTR or wouldn't have ever come otherwise, so it has built some relationships.
 - vi. We gave all \$9000 dollars to contingent faculty and graduate students. \$500 dollars on average, with some getting up to \$850, and some getting a whole conference visit underwritten.
- b. Noe: the application pool of people applying for the Muñoz has really grown. Five of six conveners have been untenured faculty. It's promoting minoritarian scholarship produced by junior faculty.
- c. Jill: the program chairs both years have included people that didn't get the award.
- d. Jill: how are we assessing this going forward? What are the assessment measures? What do the participants look like three years out? Where can we put this on the big calendar? We can use it to ask for funding later.
 - i. Scott: who determines assessment?

- ii. Jill: on the one hand it has to be from the ground up. On the other hand it needs to speak to the organization's expectations we put out in the beginning. We want to see a healthy increase in diversity.
- iii. Doug: one short-term marker is having problems like in this past year where we had so many minority panels they competed with one another.
- iv. Doug: the Muñoz is supposed to equip and get people into the organization. ASTR has to continue to create the conditions to foster a welcoming place. Muñoz is about Recruitment and ASTR is about retentions.

2. Empowerment

- a. Gender inequality and pay inequality have been the big topics from the beginning of establishing the Empowerment committee. Debra will talk a little bit about what we've done
 - i. Debra: we're having discussions in Field Conversations, including navigating gender in the workplace, navigating negotiations, and so forth. These will go forward in the future.
 - ii. Daphne: we wanted to do a smart-start workshop for instance, for negotiating a good salary. A real workshop would have cost a thousand, but did it for less. We got a guest speaker
 - iii. Daphne: we talked about #metoo and bullying, and male directors and sexual harassment. We can think more about this, too. Debra will be chair of empowerment next year, and then it would be good to have another member of the EC rotate on.
 - 1. Elizabeth Son and Kate Bredeson volunteered to serve on the committee. Debra will email them.

3. Membership

- a. We did a demographic survey two years in a row. The second year we got more reliable data and a better. Noe will talk more:
 - i. Noe: Ginny Anderson and I cycle off the committee after November conference. We learned a lot about membership and its needs. We used the Tell Me Booth, and conducted a close reading of the paper survey.
 - ii. People want more information /clarity about who the organization is. Mission and Values. How to better bring people in. It's perceived as a bunch of white people that consider white Eurocentric subjects normative and don't do a good job celebrating minoritarian work or work that is not based on historical evidence.
 - iii. Graduate students are taking up a larger percentage of membership and getting less white. How can the conference shift to better reflect this part of the membership?
 - iv. How can we provide childcare? Let's champion thinking about this and other access issues.

1. Jill: as soon as you have info about childcare, let me know, and we can get this incorporated into the conference.
- v. Rhonda what is the gender breakdown? Noe: 2/3 female 1/3 male. With about 2% non-gender- or queer-identifying.
- vi. Doug: ASTR has 81% white faculty, 60+% white grad students. We're actually doing pretty good in relation to other organizations and within a historical context. People think the organization is whiter than it is.
- b. Noe: 55 % of members come from institutions where they're only working with undergraduates. ASTR puts a lot of its resources into mentoring for graduate education. What about those who teach undergrads?
 - i. Kate: the conference is almost always during the month when people are directing undergraduate shows. Scholars from small liberal arts colleges are often the most isolated people when it comes to attending conferences.
- c. Jill: It might be interesting to look across the plenaries and look for the areas of focus. We use guiding principles when selecting plenaries with respect to historical area, etc.
- d. Two thirds found the panels diverse. A third were angry that the panels hadn't ever changed, that they were still so white.
- e. Scott: are members wondering what is happening to the survey data that has been collected? Noe: yes, people remember filling out the survey, but are wondering when they will learn about the findings. We need to do some work cleaning it up, organizing it, etc.
- f. Scott: Can we put this up soon?
- g. Daphne asks Chrystyna if she and her partner could help crunch the numbers. Chrystyna: yes.
- h. Scott: we'll work with Mei Li to get these data up on the website in a conspicuous place.

b. Looking Forward: Vision, Strategic Planning

1. The ASTR Vision: improving diversity and transnational connections; building grad student base.
 - a. Transnational Committee
 - i. Daphne initiated an event about Visa stories, since she'd spoken with people who weren't sure they could come to the conference because, for instance, they had a Syrian passport. Daphne sent out a survey, and people were glad for the chance to talk about these difficulties. Last year she did a reception herself, and this year she has decided to pitch a budget request for another event.
 - ii. Daphne wants to start a transnational committee.
 - iii. Rhonda: who all responded to the survey? Daphne: 13 or 14 percent of the membership.

- iv. Elizabeth: I was there at the reception and it was really amazing. It means a lot to the transnational students and scholars. There should be food!
2. Proposal for Transnational Award [new budget line/funding request]
- a. Daphne proposes two new funded awards for \$1000 or \$1500 each.
 - i. Daphne: I don't want this just to be a title and money, but a way to recognize the difficulty about transnational scholars' access to scholarship and resources.
 - b. James asks for definition of Transnational: Daphne: US scholars working abroad, International scholars working here. Transnational immediately evokes the idea of transfer across the border, as well as a kind of action.
 - c. Jill: can we put together a group to outline the goals and objectives for the awards for the November meeting? Would we limit eligibility to scholars who are presenting at the conference? I will start getting messages in June from people abroad who want financial help getting in. Daphne: Yes, I've already started up the group.
 - d. Doug: this is a good pilot program idea. But it also might go back to fees. There are a large number of attendees that make more than \$100,000—up to twenty percent. If we raised the fee for those members by \$50 we could raise more money.
 - i. EJ: I'm not as comfortable basing this on salary as on position.
 - ii. Debra: give people some broad categories with some really careful language.
 - iii. James: maybe list the conference rate and the suggested conference rate that is higher.
 - iv. Doug: give people the option to give more and they will: i.e., charge some of us who can afford it more to help underwrite those like transnational scholars.
 - v. Jill: I will put together language and put it up on the board tomorrow.
 - vi. Debra: let's think about language that helps people know that we're asking more from those who can afford it in order to help offset the costs for those who can't.
 - vii. Kate: there's gender involved. Men don't give to gofundme unless they're called out on Facebook. 7/8 of donors to the gofundme campaign for providing food to under-resourced ATHE attendees were women.
 - e. Esther: make the transnational award more scholarship-based and not need based. Something with a narrow focus, like the Muñoz group.
3. Mentorship Committee [new budget line/funding request]
- a. We're reviving the Mentorship Committee after it was defunct for awhile. Tracy C. Davis started it.
 - b. Let's think about a way for ASTR to help institutions host local resource events for early career scholars. ASTR can, for instance,

provide gas money for people who want to attend from within a hundred mile radius. I propose \$720-\$1000.

- c. Tracy suggests maybe creating a VP for mentorship.
 - i. Kate: is there a way to make sure we're not leaving schools out of the loop if they're not in urban centers?
 - ii. Scott: can we use the existing co-sponsored event model? We already have a budget line for it.
- d. Jill: we had a community engagement award (used to be the carbon-offset award). We've got a budget line for \$500. We need to make sure people are still overseeing it. Let's make sure it doesn't fall through the crack. Debra says she will remain on it.
 - i. Jill: We must find a way to formalize this committee (and mentorship committee) by putting it in the chart and the handbook and the spring committee report list. And the President should make sure these positions are regularly filled.

3:30 p.m. Present motions or proposals and discuss

- Kate: I would like to discuss ATAP (American Theatre Archive Project). I've been asked to be the ATAP Representative on the EC. Jill: Can you, Kate, ask ATAP if they would like space in the conference for what they want to do? We can help them.
- Noe: If there are preconference things for ATAP, can I ask something related to the fourth symposium for doctoral programs we're hosting at Tufts? Should there be a permanent group at ASTR that talks about the future of doctoral education and advocacy and training? Maybe have access to conference time and spaces. Jill: we didn't start till 5pm in Atlanta, but we're starting at 3pm this coming year, so the question of scheduling a preconference event is about whether it will be up against something on Thursday. I think you might have more luck with a Sunday afternoon.
- Jill: conferences become a place where we do a lot of different kinds of work and now we have a lot of field conversations and advocacy work. Do we need to add a Monday where we do this kind of stuff? We're using all the rooms all the time. We've cut the number of field conversations. The conference is administratively speaking at a breaking point.
- Esther: we're talking about areas of study being in peril and being advocates of those. Rhonda: we're talking about the loss of areas of scholarship. Debra: we're talking about a diversity of different kinds of scholarship.
- Jill: I think the scholarship in past years have been a lot more historical in the past year.
- Daphne: I propose we end early and then come back tomorrow with the top issues we're rising to the top.
- Jill: let's go around the room and name the hot topics we're thinking about right now, that we've talked about today or that we haven't talked about yet, to make a list to talk about tomorrow.
 - Rhonda: objects of inquiry are disappearing
 - Elizabeth: A committee or subcommittee on access and inclusivity.
 - Doug: We should change registration rates. Or maybe change membership dues according to a sliding scale, but keep conference registration the same for everyone. EJ: people don't usually renew membership if they're not going to conference. Debra: institutions often won't pay for membership fees.

- Eric: Picking a webinar topic or two? Jill: we haven't used this. If we cut this out would we stand to gain something else if we stop paying for it?
- Rhonda: There are some bad plenary papers. Do we want to ask for plenary papers to be submitted to chairs in advance? Jill: On behalf of the program chairs, we're already asking them for a lot of labor. Also, I asked plenaryists to send papers a week ahead of time for the ASL interpreters last year and most of them couldn't do that.
 - Doug: I'm against the idea of one-week deadlines on scholars or giving program chairs the additional labor of vetting. There's nothing to be done. Nobody is getting a job based on a great plenary. But people are losing jobs because of doing bad plenaries. Alice Rayner says to grad students "you haven't read enough to expect to do a plenary."
- Kate: this is for the empowerment subcommittee: I would like to brainstorm ways we can be more supportive of trans and non binary members.
- Kate: I have been surprised and saddened since the advent of #metoo about the number of people who have been harassed at ASTR. Not doing anything is not helpful. The conference environment is conducive to sexual harassment.
 - Debra: I'm putting this on the empowerment committee agenda.
 - Jill: I will also talk about this with the program chairs and make this a "time's up" situation.
 - James: we need to look at the bylaws and handbook about what our actual responsibility and authority is.
- Jill: I would like to reopen the possibility of moving totally away from print. And I have a modest proposal for moving toward this.
- Patricia: we got a lot of submissions for conference. What are the logistics of delegating the labor effectively? Jill: yes this needs to be addressed.
- Esther: Jimmy Noriega brought up how we are growing. It's great we have an increase in graduate students, but there has been a decrease in senior/veteran scholars because we are moving away from theatre history and the perception is that conference themes are getting too self-righteous and too sexy and too narrow. These are people who founded the field. It was the sixty-year anniversary and we only saw Jorge. We should honor our elders.
 - Jill: Kirsten said senior scholars felt the most alienated by moving away from print.
- Rhonda: more "traditional" stuff and positivist theatre history should not be conflated.
- Doug: the sixties generation are calling for conservatism when what they were doing was so radical. But you know what, some people got angry in the 1970s when black people came in.
- Rhonda: Elinor Fuchs and Marvin Carlson have been high profile in the recent conferences.

(4:30) 5:00 Close by Acclimation

Sunday, April 22

9:00 Open Agenda Items

- Election Slate Discussion
 - We don't vote on the election slate as submitted by the nominating committee. But we will work harder to maintain the deadlines set in the handbook.
 - First Daphne emails the Nominations Committee thanks and tells them the plan. Daphne emails everyone on the slate a heads-up and thanks. That happens tomorrow
 - On Wednesday April 25 the slate goes out to membership according to the bylaws. We have one month in order to collect additional nominations. Nominations must have a one-paragraph candidate statement and photo and nine signatories (copied on the nomination are the nine additional individual members of good standing and their copy)
 - May 25 is the deadline for nominations.
 - We open ballot for election on May 29. June 30.
- **Handbook Revisions**
 - We will go through the handbook and make sure the dates are right and the descriptions of committees are all in there.
 - Scott and Patricia will do this and get the stuff from Brockett committee. NOTE TO SCOTT: DO THIS.
 - We will change the date range eligible for book and article awards in the award descriptions themselves.
 - Jill puts some of the suggested changes into context and gives some history behind the decisions. Gad Gutterman and Paige McGinley added the best practices for Field Conversations.
 - Jill moves that we accept the change in policy to deletion of the honorarium for plenary speakers being paid at the discretion of the Vice President for Conferences, as is currently described in the handbook. James Seconds
 - Motion carries
 - Jill Moves we approve the handbook changes. EJ seconds.
 - Motion carries
- **Other Business**
- Daphne puts out a call for volunteers to look over the bylaws. Debra will help. And James and Rhonda will help.
 - Eric Recommends that this go to attorney.
 - Don't obsess over language that's the job of the attorney, says Eric.
- Program Book
 - Jill reports that the Program Chairs don't want to move to paperless program all at once. Those that register by the early bird deadline can request a program (i.e., opt in). If anyone registers after the early bird deadline or they register on site, or want a program when they get to the conference, they will pay ten dollars.

- We will ask a question on the end of conference survey whether this was an okay idea and prepare a set of other options they can select as more preferable than how we do it this next year.
- Changing fee structure.
 - Jill put together some suggestions for revised fee structure

Conference Registration Categories

\$345: Category C Individual Member (annual salary above \$175,000)*

\$295: Category B Individual Member (annual salary between \$100,000-\$175,000)*

\$245: Category A Individual Member (annual salary up to \$100,000)*

\$150: Retired Member [up from \$100]

\$125: Contingent Faculty Member [down from \$175]

\$125: Independent Scholar/Artist Member [down from \$175]

\$100: Student Member

\$385: Non-Member

*Acknowledging the disparity in income within the individual member category, these registration categories were developed to help fund conference attendance for those members with lower salaries and who have limited access to institutional funding.

- We'll increase across the board for the regular registration. Do we want do this for the one-day rate, too? Yes. Jill will make these and institute them for spring registration. Daphne: not many people do the one-day registration except the non-members who are coming in for one event. Jill: they're actually not significantly cheaper than one-day.
- Doug wonders whether officers ought to pay registration fees.
 - Jill: the program chairs don't pay registration. But everyone else pays for registration and also hotel room, minus one day that EC members get.
 - Esther says it's about recruiting leadership
 - Doug: it's not fat-catism, it's about rewarding very good and hard work of the officers, and it's an acknowledgment.
 - Jill: it makes sense that the program chairs get waived. But the officers are not going to the conference either, so they're paying for something that they're not consuming.
 - Doug: it can be an *option* to pay. If you have fat cat resources from your own institution and you can pay, great. But you shouldn't have to pay out of pocket.
- Let's talk about this as a budget item.

10:00 Vote on budget

- EJ: we are projecting a deficit because San Diego will be a lean year. This proposed budget reflects a more conservative approach, with the conference still being a satisfactory experience for people. This is a relatively accurate forecast, and probably slightly conservative.

- We expect that we'll have higher numbers than those of Portland.
- Audiovisual is the same. Food and Beverage is the same.
- In November we can revisit a lot of this. The next two conferences will have more numbers. This is a really tight time. Not the time to have rosy projections. We will run a deficit and our stock portfolio might go down if we're in a trade war with China.
 - Jill: can we keep a wish list and an initiative list for a sunnier day?
- We will not include the mentorship funding we talked about yesterday
- We will continue to do Muñoz receptions
- We will do transnational reception and if we want to get rid of it in a couple of years that's fine. Daphne will pay for this out of presidential discretionary budget.
- Kate: should we be more mindful of box lunches? Do people eat these? Jill: the anecdotal evidence says that people are very grateful for these.
- EJ asks that if line items need to be more properly named to let her know
- Jill thanks EJ for all the work
- EJ says there are things we can do to help save ASTR money. Staying at Hampton Inn instead of the fancier hotel for the EC meetings. Sharing a guest room, etc.
- We decided to increase the AV line and graduate student support line. And the book review editor will get \$1600 for an assistant for next two years.
- EJ moves that we accept the budget. Jill seconds
- Discussion:
 - Doug asks if the registration can be waived for officers
 - James asks that if we do this that it go up to the full general membership so there is transparency.
 - Jill says that Patrick brought waiving program chairs' registration in front of the general meeting.
 - Jill says she can put a motion to the Annual Meeting in November with language saying that the officers are doing this for service and not actually consuming the conference. We are giving the out of pocket paying members the option of not paying.
 - Doug: the executive committee can abstain on the vote if they like.
 - James: we shouldn't say officers will be given a choice to pay or not pay. They'll feel guilty into paying and that will defeat the purpose. Jill: I won't put that part in.
 - Jill: I will include language about leadership recruitment, need, labor, compensation, etc.
 - Jill: I think this should come from the EC to the general membership. Doug: I can present it.
 - Scott: I will remember to put this into the Annual Meeting Agenda. NOTE TO SCOTT: REMEMBER THIS
 - Scott calls the question
 - Motion carries

- Sissi wants to follow up on the inclusion committee. Can the inclusion officer be a part of the inclusion committee?
 - Jill: Ad Hoc Committees last for three years. Is this part of a standing committee?
 - Scott: can we make this a subcommittee of a standing committee like membership?
 - Jill: put the Inclusion officer on the Committee on Conferences.
 - Scott: we need to adjourn. This will be a top item on the agenda for the July teleconference: That we institutionalize inclusion in some way.

11:00 Close

- Noe moves to adjourn. Jill seconds. Adjournment by acclamation