Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. EST.

Members Present: Josh Abrams, Chase Bringardner, Carlos Alexis Cruz, Carla Della Gotta, D.J. Hopkins, Kelly Howe, Karen Jean Martinson, Noe Montez, Dassia Posner, Emily Rollie, Jon Rossini, Lionel Walsh, Harvey Young; Monica White Ndounou joined on Zoom at approximately 9:04 a.m.

Staff: Aimee Zygmanski, Devon Binder; Shaun Franklin-Sewell joined at 9:24 a.m.

Approval of Minutes
Harvey made a motion to approve the 20 November 2019 meeting minutes, seconded by Noe. Approved by voice vote. Yes= 13 No=0 Abs=0

Moment of Yay!
GC Members shared accomplishments and successes from the year.

Updates from Operations Committee Meeting
Josh discussed the importance of clarifying the MAL roles since the change to the election procedures.

Carla offered a brief recap of the OC meeting, which included discussion of the budget, the membership renewal date, the awards ceremony, engagement with senior scholars, the cost of plenaries, the benefits of ATHE membership, and letters of solidarity.

Carla expanded on the Letter of Support for Jawaharlal Nehru University. The OC split the discussion into two sections – one covering the specific letter, and the other about procedure. Josh added that the Letter of Support came together in the past two weeks, largely out of the web platform that was created around last year’s summit. The Letter has been made public, so the language will not change. Josh, who knows the scholar who drafted the letter, is confident in its accuracy. The focus on higher education is important to ATHE’s agreement to sign on. Josh will create communication to the membership with very nuanced language to make clear why this letter emerged when others have not, with perhaps a discussion of procedures about how to address other issues that come up. We would like to create as system or an invitation for members to submit well-researched concerns for similar advocacy actions.

Discussion continued surrounding the creations of a policy and/or procedure around submitting and creating letters of support. This also included the discussion of how to make the voting procedures more efficient. Currently, the OC recommends to the GC and the GC approves, and any online votes must be unanimous. Should the signing of letters of support be changed to a Presidential power? Who will do the research? Should there be a different procedure for letters we are asked to sign onto vs. letters ATHE initiates? What parameters do we adopt? How do we determine the language for the letters?

Monica noted that ASA has a very good system in place. She suggested that we look into their process to determine a system that works for ATHE. The Advocacy Committee will return to the GC with a draft proposal in the near future.

**New Membership Rates**
Kelly recapped the history of the effort to make the membership fees and conference fees more equitable by shifting to sliding scale membership. The GC then reviewed the models that Aimee put together. Kelly noted that the OC believes that it is important to move to the sliding scale for a number of reasons, but we must be fiscally responsible in making this move.

Discussion of the issue included review of lifetime membership options, a possible 3-year membership, institutional memberships, donations, and the different income range possibilities.

Aimee raised the question of whether we can change membership dues to a sliding scale without also changing conference rates; it might be difficult to roll one out without the other. She stressed that it is REALLY important that we roll at least one out, making sure that we capture the same revenue. She added that software issues must also be considered; administrative issues on the back end can complicate this process.

Action Item: Kelly made a motion to move forward with adopting a sliding scale model for membership rates and/or conference this year, seconded by Chase. Kelly, Jon, Josh, Chase, Aimee, and Shaun will consult to find a model that is projected to be revenue-neutral. Approved by voice vote. Yes=14. No=0. Abstain=0.

**Finance**
Jon discussed the current budget, explaining the past practices and accounting codes. He and Aimee are trying to address structural deficits embedded in past budget by capturing all spending. Jon went through the draft budget in detail to explain.

Because the committee needs to determine the sliding scale, we may need to wait to approve budget. The approval of budget was tabled.

Action Item: Jon made a motion to authorize Mediquis to investigate the impact of moving to socially responsible investments, seconded by D.J. Approved by voice vote. Yes=14. No=0. Abstain=0.
Action Item: Jon made a motion to approve the audit report, seconded by Harvey. Approved by voice vote. Yes=13. No=0. Abstain=1.

Action Item: Jon made a motion to approve the audit committee of Harvey, Henry, Patricia, and Jon, seconded by Carla. Approved by voice vote. Yes=13. No=0. Abstain=1.

Focus Group Representative ZOOM Call
Elena SV Flys (DTM), Amy Chaffe (VASTA), Megan Geigner (TH), Bethany Hughes (LIA proxy), Peter Harrigan (TLA), Theresa Robbins Dudeck (TASC), Bryan Vandevender (MT/D), Hank Willenbrink (PACT), Kathleen McGeever (DP), Ryan McKinney (Two Year), Valerie Clayman Pye (Acting), Jessica del Vecchio (WTP), Courtney Elkin Mohler (LIA), Reza Mirsajadi (MET) joined at 11:00 a.m. EST.

Debut Panel Portal: Aimee recapped a conversation from the FGR call, requesting that all the debut calls be put in front of our paywall. She asked FGRs to send debut calls to Shaun and Aimee. All CFPs received are up; they will add more as received. There are currently many different due dates for these. Perhaps FGRs want to consider aligning the due dates going forward?

Action Item: Lionel will put on agenda for next FGR phone call to discuss uniform debut panel submission deadline.

Difficulty of Entering into Organization: Josh encouraged FGRs to discuss and create a proposal regarding curated panels vs. individual paper submissions for August FGR/GC meeting.

Action Item: FGRs to prepare a proposal regarding curated panels vs. individualized submissions for August FGR/GC meeting.

Web Platform Changes: Aimee informed group of an alternate web platform through YM that is available that we did not know about. This offers a more robust structure for the groups pages. It will take three hours to launch change to this application. We are already paying for this platform, so it would be great to offer it. Aimee will look into this and be in touch through Lionel.

Providing Data to Focus Groups: This year, the individual submissions were down, but Multi-Disciplinary submissions were up. This is really useful information, and we will start to track submission trends going forward. Are there other data that focus groups would like to have tracked? Suggestions included: member data, participants’ histories at conference (first time attendees, returning members who have not attended conference recently); hotel reservations; when people arrive and leave. Please send additional ideas to Lionel.

Pre-con/Session Time: Past discussions around this issue raised the possibility that, with the pre-con time shortened, FGs might use time within conference for FG activities usually done at the pre-con. This would essentially be unstructured time given back to the focus groups – not for a membership meeting, but for other activities. Josh noted that this can happen, but
anything that is scheduled within conference is required to be open to all conference registrants and cannot be restricted to pre-con registrants/FG members only.

Carlos encouraged FGRs to contact him if they have ideas for all-conference events.

**Wednesday Start Date:** Anecdotal evidence suggests that the earlier start date has increased participation, but we will capture more data on this in upcoming years.

**Conference Costs:** Jon explained that the “real” cost of the annual conference is wrapped up with AV and F&B, noting how these work financially and contractually. Josh mentioned a service (mirror casting) that might allow for sharing of materials to avoid AV costs (this would require internet in rooms). There should also be transparency around what food will be provided, cost of internet, etc. Discussion of some of the challenges of the current contract for the 2020 Detroit conference ensued. It was suggested that an infographic outlining costs would be very helpful.

**Registration:** It is crucial that we are making sure people are paying. Please make sure this information is disseminated and that all panelists register.

**Day Passes/Reduced Conference Rates:** Jon went over budget structural challenges. We will continue looking at our policies as we update the Operations Manual. We should also make clear to our members the consequences of non-registration.

**FGR Boot Camp:** We are planning to develop a boot camp training for Detroit. This will allow us to dig down into questions surrounding organizational structure, legally and practically.

**Award Nominations:** Dassia went over nominations, including how many we have received. She noted that some categories currently do not have any nominations. Dassia requests that each of us choose an award and field a nominee, so that we have a rich pool. Nominations roll over from year to year.

**Nominations Committee:** We need nominations from FGRs of members who might serve on the Nominations Committee.

**Action Item:** Please get names to Lionel within two weeks. These do not need to be FGRs, but must be members from focus groups. Lionel will solicit names and conduct election electronically.

**Other Business:** Lionel noted that this was a very successful call with strong participation. Perhaps, if this success continues, we might schedule more time for these meetings. We hope to improve communication between GC and FGRs and this is a good first step.

Might also be good to come up with one sheet of budget information that can be circulated through membership. Part of that is prioritizing how money is spent – e.g. put money toward AV vs. conference grants.

Aimee is working on a communications schedule.
Lionel and Josh will report back individually on other issues raised in FG reports.

Break for lunch at 12:26 p.m., the meeting resumed at 1:59 p.m.

Awards
Dassia clarified some budget/language issues from the Operations Manual. She will sit down with Aimee to discuss further. After reviewing the comments in the Awards section of the Ops Manual, the GC discussed adjustments to awards committee and processes. Currently, there is no committee membership rotation noted. Dassia has drafted a process based on what is included in the R&P process, though different awards have different process requirements (e.g. Jane Chambers has multiple rounds of review). The GC provided feedback on the proposed new elements. Having consistent service procedures (similar to ASTR) might be an excellent model to adopt.

Dassia reviewed a question that often comes up regarding whether nominations/nominees should be ATHE members. She has included the language, “ATHE membership is encouraged but not required of nominators and nominees,” which is an improvement from no language.

Another question of language surrounds the lack of clarity around press submissions. Is it that a press may submit five books, or that each editor may? This impacts large presses where editors might be in different areas, and therefore are not in communication. This may impact serving on committee, by reducing the reading requirements. The GC noted that, as long as we allow nominations from others (self or other), limiting what a press can submit might be okay. We will revisit next year.

Dassia recommended decoupling ATDS from the article award (p.10).

Dassia would also like to institute a formal short list process and a formal honorable mention. A short list could be disseminated by June. This could generate interest around a larger number of books and give scholars a CV entry. This could be instituted for best book, edited collections (not lifetime achievement years), and possibly best article (this would depend on the number of submissions).

Action Item: Dassia made a motion to institute formal short list process and formal honorable mention process for selected awards, seconded by D.J. Approved by voice vote. Yes = 13. No=0. Abstain=0.

Dassia also noted the possibility of creating a first monograph award. This would be done for two reasons: 1. To divide the work of committee and lighten workload 2. Division in early/late career would allow us to celebrate emerging authors. She suggested that authors could only be nominated for one book award. Dassia believes that money already exists in budget, as long as we adhere to the language in the Ops Manual. We could offer this award every other year. Carla suggested changing the language so that authors are only eligible for one award, but without suggesting a hierarchy between the two awards. Perhaps these might be named awards; this might be a good opportunity for sponsorship.
Action Item: Dassia will draft specific language for first monograph award to discuss at a later GC meeting. We can consider adding this award. She will work with Jon on finding awards revenue streams.

Leadership Institute
Noe updated the GC about the *Cultivating Leadership* copy editing. This book project emerged from the Leadership Institute; it was developed by Mark and Bobby to replace a different book that had been given to LI participants. They are requesting $2700 for copy editing, which may include the needed funds to format for Amazon publication; if not, it may cost an additional $100-$500. We have three options:

1. Elect not to fund anything, as the money is no longer allocated in budget. We would allow Mark and Bobby to pursue other publishing opportunities. This is the least desirable option.
2. Agree to pay the formatting for Amazon, based on the current manuscript. The book would be ready for ATHE 2020, but will lack another needed round of copy editing.
3. Pay for all; this will allow us to release the most perfect version of text. The book might not be ready for ATHE 2020, as it would be a tight timeline.

The GC discussed larger LI issues, noting that many mentors and volunteers have contributed chapters to this manual. It was determined that if the GC funds the copyediting, any royalties should belong to ATHE.

Action Item: Noe made a motion to fund $3000 for copy editing and Amazon formatting, seconded by D.J. Approved by voice vote. Yes=11. No=0. Abstain=1.

*Ann Haugo and Monica joined via Zoom*

Noe reviewed some of the details surrounding the LI. A concern is that the LI is currently not sustainable. While there are sponsorship efforts by Steve Peters, this does not meet the costs of the LI. He is recruiting 20-25 people per year. There has been unclear accounting around this. Shaun suggested that a better process is for ATHE to invoice these sponsors. The LI continues with much volunteer labor, but it needs to be aligned to ATHE’s mission and values.

Discussion of the model and structure of LI ensued. The consensus was that the LI could potentially be a larger revenue stream for ATHE. We should be driving this, especially because it has the potential to be a site of great innovative and growth. THE LI is under ATHE purview.

A diverse group of people should be on subcommittee to consider the LI relationship; another possibility is to commission a set of external evaluators to review curriculum, surveys, etc. An external review could be more formal, could have people sit in. Or we could commission a review among former attendees and board members (Tiffany Ana Lopez, Daniel Banks, Bill Doan, Stephen Di Benidetto, Heather Nathans, etc.) and perhaps offer tuition reimbursement for two other reviewers to attend who have no legacy with LI.

Action Item: Noe will reach out to potential reviewers in the upcoming weeks.
Conference Policies Review

We are hoping to move toward a registration process that includes all options for registrants on the same form (workshops, events, dietary restrictions, has this person attended before, etc.). This will allow to better track information. Aimee and Shaun will need to know what information we want to know by March 15, if that is feasible (especially for workshops).

Chase recommended reaching out directly to department chairs about sending people just to experience ATHE.

Wednesday Start: Question around the efficacy of the Wednesday start this year. Our submissions are very low, so it might be nice to leave Wednesday open for pre-cons. At what point in the conference planning process should we make this decision? It is tricky because we want to increase participation. Perhaps commit to Thursday morning start of conference with Wednesdays available for pre-cons for next two years. Aimee will have more information about the Wednesday-Sunday schedule for the next GC conference call.

Timing for OC/GC Meetings: ATHE used to schedule pre- and post- conference meetings for GC/OC. There should also be a longer meeting in person on site. Perhaps the FGR/GC meeting happens later in the afternoon/evening. Nominees should be told of scheduling expectations.

‘Live’ Peer Review Options: There is a need, especially for practitioners, to get peer reviews of the activities they lead at ATHE. Can we request volunteer adjudicators? Due to their workloads, Aimee and Shaun cannot oversee this. Moreover, there are liability issues if ATHE administers this. However, ATHE could set up template or a Google form to help facilitate.

Action Item: Aimee will look at the capabilities of the new platform and/or create Google form that the FGs in need of peer reviews could then administer.

Non-Registrants: Aimee recommends we adopt a policy that names are pulled from programs without registration/membership by a certain date. Jon added that we should have a way to document participation for those who are there in case of errors. Also discussed how to monitor registration – perhaps student volunteers can monitor (but not be responsible for enforcement).

Discussion of joint rate with BTN/ATHE: Unfortunately, we cannot repeat free entry, as was the case in Chicago. Josh has reached out to Chris at BTN; Monica will be speaking to Chris about other issues and will ask him to be in touch.

Pre-con Funding: The grant requests are unsustainable at this point. Shaun noted that, if FGs are taking in money for pre-con events, that should go through ATHE. There are questions with the grant proposals, especially around issues of fiscal responsibility. We want to be sure that pre-cons are not taking from others. We also want to collect information and determine criteria for evaluating proposals. GC agreed that Aimee, Josh, and Carlos should make whatever decisions about the Detroit pre-con submissions are necessary.
Took a break at 4:14 p.m., returned at 4:30 p.m.

Ops Manual Review

New White Papers: Monica asked about the process for the inclusion of new white papers in the Ops Manual. Josh suggested that it is a two-step process: The first step should be that the proposed new white papers should come to the GC to get approval for creation. The second step is for the appropriate committee to create white paper, which then gets approved by GC. Monica will be in touch with any additional questions around policy/white paper.

Monica suggested a white paper on motherhood advocacy. There are particular constituencies (e.g. graduate students, women of color) for whom the policy must differ.

Action Item: Jon made a motion to approve the creation of the ETC social media white paper, seconded by Harvey. Approved by voice vote. Yes= 14. No=0. Abstain=0.

Policies to be Updated: Several policies are clearly from a specific time. Do we want to build in a review and update process? Perhaps in next revision of Ops Manual, we include a policy review. The GC might also try to pull unnecessary items and put in appendix.

Regarding the structure of manual, Josh suggests that we use the following model:

- All GC members will, followed by specific GC positions
- All committees will, followed by specific details of committee

Action Item: Carla will contact all MALs and they will review language of their positions.

Committee Chair Updates

PDC

Action Item: Noe made a motion for the PDC to create white paper on academic job hiring practices, as a joint project with ASTR New Paradigms in Graduate Education subcommittee, seconded by Harvey. Joint project will ensure a wider body of search, and also because there is an extant committee through ASTR, this will save work. Approved by voice vote. Yes= 12. No=0. Abstain=1.

A white paper on assessment commissioned by Barbara Parisi will come before the committee in March.

Dissertations in Progress is moving online. A request has been made at US institutions; Noe stated that he expects to receive information this month. Josh will also circulate through UK institutions, and Lionel is willing to circulate to Canada. Listings will stay on DiP until the dissertation is finished.

R&P

D.J. asked of our journal publishing, what happens if we move 100% online? The committee will research the possibilities and bring that information to the GC.
**Membership**
Kelly noted some concerns about policing registrations on-site. She hopes that the current plans about removing names from the program might address the issue.

**ETC**
Aimee noted that they have been working with Devon to look into alternate AV modes for presentations at conference – can someone on ETC research?

**Focus Group Task Force**
The task force members were approved. Chase noted the wide spectrum of perspectives on the task force: some are very invested in FG structure and others are frustrated with it. Communication is a key issue the task force has identified. The task force hopes to encourage FG members to see themselves not just as FG members but also as members of ATHE. It has also discussed the training of FGRs through boot camps; the evaluating pre-conferences; the gathering of member specific data; and scheduling issues around conference attendance

Finally, it was noted that the FGR meeting at the annual conference often does not have an agenda. The annual reports can be used to create one, which can be sent out in advance. It might also be productive to begin in the joint GC/FGR meeting together, split for GC and FGR meetings, and then reconvene.

**Neglecting Duties on Elected Position**
The GC is considering drafting a by-law detailing how to handle GC members who are not able to fulfill their duties. Ann pointed out by-law 8.4. What about solidifying the procedures around this? Also, we should have a procedure for FGRs who are not fulfilling duties. It would be useful to develop a leave of absence/parental/medical leave procedure.

**Executive Director**
**Conference Locations:** Aimee shared that the OC approved Austin as site for 2021 conference, for 8/1-8/8. The room rate is $189 including tax at the Hyatt Regency. Through discussion, the GC realized that Texas is on the California Blacklist. This would likely impact participation

Aimee will work with Devon to try to secure locations; we are looking for 21, 22, 23.

**Social Media:** Aimee and Shaun are working on a social media rollout. ATHE has a FB page, and they will plan administration of that page. YM is unveiling new platform for communication that will update the front end of our ATHE site.

**Contracts:** Shaun and Devon are contracted through the end of 2020, and we will be working with the same bookkeeping firm.

**Conference Committee:** Tomorrow the GC is scheduled to meet with the conference committee. The GC will join in the morning. Aimee is not sure who has made it to Detroit, with the weather and travel disruptions.
Spring Meeting Schedule – The best time for GC conference calls are Wednesdays around 11/10/9/8.

Final Notes: Josh added that he appreciated everyone’s contribution to ATHENews. He has only gotten good feedback from members. The January edition is delayed, though Dassia and Harvey have submitted.

Adjourn
With all business completed, the meeting was adjourned at 6:06 p.m. EST.

Matters Arising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>PAGE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Agreed to sign JNU Letter of Support.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Membership to move forward with switch to sliding scale model; Kelly, Jon, Josh, Chase, Aimee, and Shaun will determine best model for implementation.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>GC authorized Jon’s inquiry to Mediqus regarding the impact of moving to socially responsible investments.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Approval of audit report.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Approval of audit committee (Harvey, Henry, Patricia, and Jon).</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lionel</td>
<td>Add discussion of Debut Panel due date alignment to FGR Conference Call agenda</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGRs</td>
<td>Prepare proposal for handling curated panels vs. individualized paper submissions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGRs</td>
<td>Field names of members to serve on Nominations Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lionel</td>
<td>Will conduct electronic election from fielded candidates</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Approval of motion to institute formal short list process and honorable mention process</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dassia</td>
<td>Will draft language for addition of first manuscript award</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noe</td>
<td>Reach out to potential LI reviewers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee</td>
<td>Look at YM platform/Google form for peer reviewers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Jean</td>
<td>ETC to begin draft of social media at conferences white paper</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carla

Contact MALs to review position language in Ops Manual

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Jean Martinson, ATHE Secretary