

**Minutes of the Spring 2008 ASTR Executive Committee
Meeting
Orrington Hotel, Evanston Illinois
15-16 March 2008**

Present: Tracy Davis (President), Ric Knowles (Vice President), Kim Marra (Secretary), Tobin Nellhaus (Treasurer), Nancy Erickson (Administrator, *ex officio*), Virginia Anderson (GSC Representative), Lesley Ferris, Nadine George-Graves, James Harding, Daphne Lei, Ramón Rivera-Servera, Rebecca Schneider, Karen Shimakawa, Andrew Sofer, Harvey Young, Ted Ziter

Absent: Tamara Underiner, Brandi Catanese

SATURDAY 15 MARCH

The President called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m., made introductions, and explained the agenda. The plan was to move through all the discussion topics on Saturday and then return to financial decisions Sunday morning. Final approval of the budget would be done via e-mail in early May.

Reports from Officers and Administrator, with business arising:

1. Secretary

a) MOTION to approve the Minutes of the Fall 07 EC Meeting. Moved by Harding, seconded by Knowles. The Minutes were unanimously approved with minor corrections: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

b) MOTION to approve the Addendum to the Secretary's Report recording e-votes taken since the Fall 07 EC Meeting. Moved by Anderson, seconded by Ferris. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

c) MOTION to ratify the President's appointments to committees posted on the ASTR Web site. Moved by Rivera-Servera, seconded by Nellhaus. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

d) MOTION to approve the election slate of names submitted by the Nominating Committee and prepared by the Secretary. Moved by Sofer, seconded by Rivera-Servera. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

2. Vice-President

2008 Boston Conference

a) A question arose from Program Chair Jill Lane's Report regarding multiple appearances on the program. In the past, one could appear in a Working Group and Seminar or Plenary but could not apply to multiple Seminars. One could apply for a plenary and then, if not accepted, apply for a Seminar or Working Group. Because the Working (or Research) Groups were a separate category, one could participate in them AND be in a Plenary or Seminar. But now that all group meetings are homogenized, the proviso of appearing once on the program is pertinent, with the exception of chairing a session. The President recommended that we give feedback to Jill for this year, then have the Committee on Conferences come up with a policy. The EC advised Program Chair Lane to limit appearances on the program to one per individual. The onus is on the Program Chair to make sure that only one acceptance occurs. This should be clarified in the next Call for Papers. Scheduling should be arranged to allow those committed to an ongoing Working Group to participate.

2009 Conference

b) Regarding the conference site, Vice-President Knowles reported that prospective Program Chairs Sonja Kuftinec and Tamara Underiner are committed to San Juan, Puerto Rico. In response to Kuftinec and Underiner's draft call for "Theater, Performance and Desti-Nation," the EC considered ways it could be opened up and made more inviting to compensate for possible lack of attendance. There was concern that this proposal might be too similar to the previous one, and people might be tired of problematizing America again. "Desti-Nation" could be fleshed out to apply to more of the Caribbean and beyond, and the issue of nationalism could be more fully engaged. Kuftinec and Underiner were encouraged to lead with the contemporary and historical world political situation, and then use the conference site as a "for example." They were also encouraged to think more about travel and the economy of tourism.

Regarding lodging in Puerto Rico, we want to be as close to Old San Juan as possible. There are only three hotels in Old San Juan and only one theatre. The lodging price won't be lower than 2008. It was pointed out that Puerto Rico is a U.S. territory; U.S. citizens don't need a passport to travel there. Administrator Erickson will report on lodging options and costs in mid-April, and the EC will vote on the site via e-mail. She is looking into Miami as an alternate.

The EC agreed that we need to settle on the site first; if it's Puerto Rico, Kuftinec and Underiner will be chairs, if approved. Meanwhile, they can work on the CFP.

2010 Conference

c) The Committee on Conferences recommends Seattle first, then Minneapolis. ASTR has not been to the Northwest in a long time. Anderson reported that the Graduate Student Caucus is concerned about the costs of going to San Juan, although it could cost more to go to Seattle. Erickson will look into costs of hotels and airfares.

d) The Vice-President presented a list of possible themes generated by the Committee on Conferences and asked what would be the most compelling (for 2010, or as a backup for 2009). The EC expressed enthusiasm for the following: “The Clandestine” (a capacious and interesting topic); “War” (exciting but may overlap too much with the San Juan theme); “Revolutionary Theatre”; “theatres of/beyond the human”; “theatre and ‘reality’” (not something we have taken up recently, though Harry Elam chaired “Theatre and the Real” in San Diego).

e) The EC agreed with the Vice President that it is important that the conference chair be able to fund artists as well as extradisciplinary and international scholars. This has happened in an ad hoc fashion; we need a policy that clarifies criteria. How can we distinguish between this and honoraria? We need to establish categories, e.g., travel funding for international undersupported scholars, undersupported (local) artists, travel for invited speakers outside the discipline. In a straw poll, the EC voted in favor of exploring this and agreed to consider it as a budget item for this year with potential implementation at the Boston conference. We would like the Committee on Conferences to offer further articulation of the policy via e-mail.

3. Treasurer and Administrator

a) Treasurer Nellhaus reported that the portfolio (as of March) had lost 10% since December, but in 2007 we beat most comparable indexes.

b) According to Erickson’s budget spread sheets, we will be ahead of last year because we withdrew from investments last year to cover expenses from the 50th anniversary celebration, launching the new Web site, and increasing conference costs. We won’t be able to do this in the future because we will be using investment funds for awards, etc. Nellhaus asked that we set a serious budget due date by which committees need to present requests to the Treasurer. Zero-sum budgeting requires anticipating costs much more accurately.

c) In a fund-raising campaign such as we are mounting, no one wants to give money for operating expenses. The advice of the campaign committee is that funds should be raised to go into endowment, while the costs of fundraising should come out of the budget. The campaign will be conducted on many fronts. The three priorities are: graduate student support, international diversification, research fellowships and awards. However, an estate award may specify a purpose; we need to take each one on a case by case basis.

In contrast to named gifts and proceeds from the fundraising campaign, incidental donations have been going into operating expenses. We need a policy. We need to look at the membership renewal form to clarify how people give money so that donors are not confused. We don't want to give a message that there is a fund raising campaign and other donation outlets; all donations should be funneled into the current campaign for its duration.

MOTION: That the fund raising campaign will target contributions to the endowment. Moved by Knowles, seconded by Harding. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

d) The Treasurer presented the EC with a menu of additional expenditure issues to discuss:

-We need to increase the budget for the conference to cover rising costs. These include full A/V service so the conference runs more smoothly. The EC requested that the Committee on Conferences develop an A/V policy so that we can restrict the number of formats.

-Food and beverage costs are going up; we need refreshments during breaks. These are making the conference run more smoothly. The EC was divided on whether ASTR should continue to pay for a drink at the reception. It was suggested that the Committee on Conferences and the Program Chair be made responsible for finding a sponsor for the reception. For example, Cambridge University Press might be approached.

-Fund-raising campaign expenses: We have a donor to cover the cost of designing, printing, and distributing a brochure for the campaign. To cover other expenses from ordinary revenues, the EC agreed to pencil in a budget line for the first year (campaign length is proposed to be three years).

-EC Travel: Should ASTR provide full coverage for EC member lodging during meetings (full stay for Spring Meeting, and extra night for Fall meeting)? Institutions may still be willing to pay all or part of the expense; we need to cost out the allowance per person. People can still choose to room share. In a straw vote, the EC agreed to cover 100% of hotel for the Spring meeting. For the fall meeting, the EC agreed that the GSC Rep should have lodging funded for the extra night. We encourage other EC members to look for institutional support, but ASTR will pay up to a certain amount if their institutions will not.

-Increase *Theatre Survey* from 2 issues to 3: This would not happen in the next fiscal year, but we should plan for it now. Subscription rates will go up because of mailing rates. Subscription costs are folded into membership dues. Further discussion was deferred until the Publications Committee Report.

-Web site costs: We need to get more information before we approve the budget. We may need to hire someone to maintain Web site. How do we cover the service that Ken Cerniglia has provided? This was tabled for later.

-Carbon Offsets: The EC agreed in principle that we should have some mechanism that enables members to designate funds to offset carbon footprints. In a straw vote, we decided that ASTR should pay half up to \$1000, and that individuals be given the option to contribute to the other half. The EC would approve the company that provides the off-set, and there would be a line on the registration form presenting the option.

e) The discussion then turned to how to increase revenue: Should this be done through dues, conference fees, or both? How could we meet an increased income goal of, say, \$25,000-\$30,000? Roughly half the membership comes to the conference, so to increase dues would spread the costs more effectively than upping registration. Anderson pointed out that, like faculty, graduate students can get reimbursement for conference attendance but not membership dues. She stressed the importance of keeping graduate student costs down. It is likely that travel costs will go up this fall. The EC's advice to the Finance Committee: We support an increase on both dues and conference registration, but with the majority of the increase on dues, except that we do not want costs to be raised for graduate students.

The Treasurer had submitted a detailed proposal from the Finance Committee in his report prior to the meeting for a tiered fee system. He noted that the principle behind such a system is economic equity. The report proposed that the system be based solely on gross income and that there be four tiers keyed to average salaries nationally of faculty in the performing arts. The President ceded the chair to the Vice President so she could speak as an EC member in the discussion. She argued that tiering doesn't really address inequity; assistant professors often get more resources to cover conference fees, travel, etc., than tenured faculty, and people across the ranks have other encumbrances on their income. Tiering based on household income is unfair unless financial aid applications are filled out, and that is impractical.

Speaking as President, Davis expressed feeling responsible for fiscal solvency and membership retention. What will give us predictability of income and retention or growth in members? The most flux occurs around graduate students. She argued that tiering works against retaining members as they move through the ranks. Tiering might also risk alienating senior members who would be assessed the highest fees at a time when we are seeking their support in a capital campaign. Erickson added that tiers could have a greater negative impact than just doing a percentage increase on Individual members. A straight average calculated by dividing total expenses by the number of members yields a cost per member of \$137.00 to run ASTR. A straw vote was taken on instituting tiers, and the result was negative. The Treasurer requested that the breakdown of votes be reported: 6 in favor of tiers, 7 against, 2 abstained.

f) On the question of imposing different charges for foreign members, the Officers recommended that rather than putting them in a separate membership category, we should have them pay increased postage.

MOTION: ASTR shall add a surcharge for members with mailing addresses outside the U.S. The surcharge will be displayed as a separate item on the dues form, and it will reflect actual mailing costs. Moved by Nellhaus, seconded by Rivera-Servera. The motion was deferred until further discussion of the budget.

Standing Committees

4. Nominating Committee

a) MOTION: To adopt the following non-discrimination statement from Committee Chair Heather Nathans' Report as policy for the Nominating Committee: "In considering candidates for nomination, the American Society for Theatre Research does not discriminate based on race, color, sex, gender status, sexual orientation, national origin, age, religion, or disability status. Additionally, in considering candidates for nomination, the American Society for Theatre Research seeks to represent a broad spectrum of scholarly interests that reflects the diversity of the field(s) of Theatre and Performance Studies." Moved by Ziter, seconded by Shimakawa. A friendly amendment by Marra to change "gender status" to "gender identification" was accepted. The motion carried: 14 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention.

b) Nathans reported difficulty getting a full slate of candidates for the election this year. Her committee recommends putting out an open call to the membership for people to indicate interest in service to ASTR. The EC discussed the committee's proposed wording of such a statement in Nathans' report and charged the Nominating Committee, in consultation with the President and Secretary, to revise it to cast as wide a net as possible and to include a deadline (e.g., October 1) to allow time for the President to make appointments prior to the November meeting. The EC ratified this as advice to the Nominating Committee and as practice to be implemented, effective immediately.

5. Graduate Student Caucus

a) GSC Representative Anderson reported considerable progress toward the goal of full engagement of graduate student members within ASTR. The Graduate Student Caucus met during the November conference and discussed a number of issues, including mentorship of new members, research funding, coordination of home stays for research trips, conference attendance costs, childcare at conferences, and year-round correspondence within the GSC. Anderson added that already students from Emerson are interested in getting involved in the Boston conference. The President extended kudos to Anderson for her outstanding leadership efforts. The GSC was encouraged to submit a formal budgeting proposal.

6. Fellowships and Grants

a) MOTION: That the official name of the Marshall grants be changed to the Thomas Marshall Graduate Student Awards. Moved by Anderson, seconded by George-Graves. Putting the words “Graduate Student Award” in the name of the Marshall grants is intended to flag them so more graduate students will apply. The GSC should also promote these awards on their page of the ASTR Web site. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

b) 2008 Program Chair Jill Lane’s report raised the question of whether application dates for the Keller and Marshall awards should be pushed back to such a time as when we know who has been accepted for the conference. She recommends moving the deadline to the summer. When acceptance notices go out, a reminder can be included that people apply for these awards. Originally, the grants were just to get people to the conference whether they were on the program or not. We do not preclude people who are not on the program from applying. The Committee on Conferences will take this up and come back to us with a proposal.

c) The Distinguished Scholar selection process: The past three recipients constitute a subcommittee who generate a list of possible recipients. For the last two years, there has been a general call for nominations, but names have not been forthcoming from the membership. What role should the EC take in the Distinguished Scholar selection process? Posted criteria for the award stipulate service to ASTR; what about honoring a distinguished individual from another organization? We could include a note in the conference packet asking people to nominate. Is it advisable for the selection committee to be previous winners? Does that make this a self-replicating process, like a legacy award? What about having some EC appointees on the selection committee? Should the President or Vice-President serve on the selection committee? The EC affirmed that involvement in ASTR should be written in as part of the criteria for this award. When should the EC ratify the award winner? The committee needs until June 30 to make their selection, then the President notifies the recipient. The EC could then approve by e-mail. Should the President also be involved in selection process?

The EC approved the following recommendation: That the President serve as part of the selection committee. The President may designate someone to serve in his or her place; since the current President is a Distinguished Scholar recipient and thus serves on the committee already, she indicated she would delegate the Chair of the Fellowships & Awards Committee to serve in her stead. These procedures will be added to the Handbook. Kelly should add language clarifying that the involvement in ASTR is a significant criterion of the award but is not required.

President Davis extended the nomination deadline from 15 March to 17 March 2008 and

encouraged EC members to submit nominations.

d) MOTION: to approve the Co-Sponsored Events Grant proposal submitted by Leo Cabranes-Grant and Catherine Cole for \$1500.00 to support the African and Afro-Caribbean Performance Conference to take place at UC Berkeley 26-27 September 2008. The money is intended to help academics from those regions attend the conference. The conference will lead to a special issue of *Theatre Survey*. Moved by Ramon-Servera, seconded by Ferris. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

e) Report of the ASTR ad hoc Committee on the Intranational Exchange Grant Proposal: The President thanked Andrew Sofer (chair), Brandi Catanese, and Robert Schanke for their service on this committee. The committee recommends changing the name of the award from “Intranational Exchange” to “Domestic Exchange.”

MOTION: to approve the committee’s guidelines for the award as specified in Appendix A of their report, with the amendments indicated in the text below (underlined words were added by the EC):

ASTR Domestic Exchange Program (up to \$1500)

Purpose/Objectives: To promote exchange among theatre scholars across different academic and community contexts within the U.S. by facilitating reciprocal visits by faculty between two host institutions. The primary aim is to foster long-term relationships to benefit faculty who work in different institutional environments. The exchange ~~could~~ would take the form of collaboration on ~~a) a scholarly and/or production project; or b) course development and/or classroom teaching~~ creative research. A subsidiary goal is to enrich and diversify ASTR's membership. Faculty participants who are not already members of ASTR will receive an introductory offer of a complementary year of membership. It is expected that a timely report of the project will be made available to the ASTR membership through a Newsletter article. Later scholarly products might include a seminar or plenary presentation at the annual meeting, or an article in *Theatre Survey*.

Application Procedures/Guidelines for Submission: Applications must include: (1) Two-page CVs of the faculty project leaders. (2) A 750-1000 word description of the proposed activities, including the dates of the reciprocal visits; the title and focus of the collaborative project; the research methods and scholarly goals of the project; the pedagogical methods and goals of the project; explanation of how the project will engage each of the on-site communities; explanation of how the project fulfills the purpose of the award; and explanation of the proposed outcome (e.g., article proposal to *Theatre Survey*). (3) A budget, including the kind and degree of material contribution (financial or in-kind) each host institution can offer (if an institution cannot offer any funds, a note of explanation should be provided). (4) A letter of support from a department head from each of the host institutions. Award

recommendation will be made by appointed members of the Executive Committee and presented to officers of ASTR for approval.

Eligibility: At least one participant from a host institution must be a current member of ASTR.

Evaluation Criteria: (1) Feasibility of the project in terms of the qualifications of the participants and institutional support offered. (2) Significance of the project's potential to bridge specific differences between types of institutions/communities. (3) Potential for enlarging ASTR's purview and enriching and diversifying its membership. Priority consideration will be given to applications that involve faculty at teaching institutions, faculty at institutions currently underrepresented in ASTR's membership, and/or faculty at institutions that do not traditionally sponsor visiting scholars in the field of theater studies.

The motion carried: 11 yes, 4 no, 0 abstentions. The award will be adopted into the 2010 budget, and the first call for applications will go out in the 2009 awards cycle.

7. Publications Committee

a) Proposal to revise the Mission Statement of *Theatre Survey* by Publications Committee Chair James Harding and *Theatre Survey* editor Martin Puchner:

This statement is a slight revision of the statement approved by the Executive Committee in 1995:

Theatre Survey is chartered by the American Society for Theatre Research as a theatre history journal. Its theatrical and historical orientations are both broadly conceived. Performance-centered studies are welcome from all points across all historical, cultural, and methodological spectra, as are historiographic studies. ~~Dramatic literature studies not substantively related to actual performance normally would be outside the journal's purview.~~

Puchner articulated the rationale for the change in his Editorial Comment on "the 'd' word" in *Theatre Survey* 48 (November 2007): 225-227.

MOTION: To approve the revised Mission Statement of *Theatre Survey*. Moved by Harding, seconded by Sofer. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

b) Publications Committee Chair James Harding prepared a document entitled "Editorial Policy, Procedures, and Practices for *Theatre Survey*" for EC review. This document will be entered into the ASTR Handbook. It contains a number of changes from previous policy, including the following: Rather than being *ex officio*, the Associate Editor serves as

a member of the search committee for the new Associate Editor. The search for the Book Review Editor includes both the Editor and Associate Editor as voting members of the committee. The President clarified that it is not usually the procedure of the EC to vote up contents of the Handbook when they are established practice, but policy amendments do require EC approval.

MOTION: That the “Editorial Policy, Procedures, and Practices for *Theatre Survey*” be approved. Moved by Harding, seconded by Young. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. The EC extended thanks to Harding for all his work on this document.

c) On the question of whether *Theatre Survey* should go to three issues: The EC advised Harding to consult with the Editor, Associate Editor, and Cambridge University Press about this and to report in November when we will have a detailed discussion. Martin Puchner and Catherine Cole could come in late on our meeting day and join the discussion. A major motive for increasing the number of issues is to allow for more special issues. Will we have enough submissions to sustain three issues a year? Harding was asked to look over the last five years and report on the submission rate and to consult with the editors of other theatre history journals, such as *Theatre Research International*, *Theatre Journal*, *Theatre History Studies*, and the *New England Theatre Journal*.

d) The EC will need to approve another Associate Editor in November because Puchner’s term is coming to an end. Please send recommendations to Harding.

e) Discussion of the Newsletter was deferred.

Reports from Ad hoc Committees:

8. Archives

a) The Archives Policy Review Committee Report and Draft Guidelines were submitted by the committee for EC review and approval. President Davis declared it momentous to have this report; what we decide about its recommendations will last much longer than other decisions we make. She extended many thanks to the committee: Tamara Underiner (chair), Gary Jay Williams, Margaret Knapp, and Susan Brady. President Davis reported that she followed up with Don Wilmeth and Marti LoMonoco, both of whom have had curatorial experience, as well as the Northwestern Librarian. All endorsed the committee’s recommendations.

MOTION to approve the Archives Policy Review Committee Report and Draft Guidelines. Moved by Marra, seconded by Nellhaus. What is archived in terms of correspondence would be up to the individual officer making deposit. We don’t give rights to our material

to the University of Maryland; the donor retains the rights. It's up to the proprietor whether correspondence is archived; publication requires permission of both the proprietor and the correspondent. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

b) The Archives Policy Review Committee also presented a draft of a Deed of Gift to govern the terms of housing our archives at the University of Maryland.

MOTION to adopt Deed of Gift. Moved by Ziter, seconded by Young. A question arose for our legal counsel: University of Maryland has a way out of the agreement, but ASTR does not. There is only open access to nonrestricted material. Otherwise, only the Archivist, President, and donor have access. Officers can authorize someone else to have access. We don't want to give away literary rights. Do we want a mechanism to reserve/extend copyright? What is the timing of when we can pull material—can a donor subsequently go through and have material pulled? We might be able to ask the President to extend closure. President Davis will work with Archivist Heather Nathans and Gary Williams on what to do with sensitive materials, e.g., reader's reports for *Theatre Survey*. They will open in 25 yrs but we need to ascertain when the clock begins. We should make clear to people when documents are subject to archiving. Davis will ask Nathans to work with the Publication Committee to develop guidelines on *Theatre Survey* materials. The motion was withdrawn, pending clarification of these issues.

9. Fund Raising

a) President Davis reported on the status of the fund raising campaign. She is chair of the committee for the interim, but she does not intend to remain so for the long term. The committee does not have complete consensus. Some want 100% participation, whether donating money, time, or objects. The name "Centennial Campaign" was deemed "pallid but fine." Another possible choice is "ASTR Fellowship Campaign." How do we acknowledge donors? Should we designate donors by how soon people get into the campaign? As to the phasing and duration of campaign, we are presently we are in the "quiet phase" (terminology comes from Steve Grossman) when we do planning and make quiet approaches to key donors. This lasts until fall. Then we enter the "noisy phase" with the official launch at the conference. We are looking to utilize the all-conference reception for the launch. There will be a brief training session following the Fall EC meeting for EC and fund raising committee members to learn how to cultivate donors. Steve Grossman will do this for us. President Davis wants the EC to extend the work of the fund raising committee. After the first three years of the campaign, we re-evaluate where we are. The campaign has three objectives: to increase support to graduate students, international outreach, and fellowships & awards. Subcommittees are working on reports for November. Do we go beyond our own membership to other organizations and theatres? President Davis would like all members of EC to contribute in time for the launch in November. We can write a check to "ASTR" with a note for the fund raising campaign. There will be space on the membership renewal form to make a contribution. The key is the

percentage of people donating rather than the amount. Text is being generated for the publicity brochure; this is an important moment for articulating the value of our scholarly work. Rebecca Schneider volunteered to help with that articulation.

10. Handbook

a) The Secretary presented a draft of a policy on “Electronic Deliberations and Voting” for the Handbook for EC discussion and approval. She and President Davis compiled the draft with consultation from ASTR committee chairs who extensively use e-discussion, as well as past and current presidents of IFTR, about their successful use of this medium. James Harding was also consulted and provided input in advance of the meeting. Administrator Erickson will contact the state of New Jersey (where ASTR is incorporated) to see if there are any rules for on-line deliberations that we need to consider—her guess is that there are not. We decided we could proceed to a vote and then amend the document if need be. The document is intended to clarify when the e-deliberation constitutes a discussion and when it constitutes a special meeting. A special meeting is NOT one that follows up on an in-person meeting; a special meeting can be called to bring new business or an unanticipated motion forward in between semi-annual meetings. A special meeting requires special notice. We still have to have a quorum for discussion and voting on follow-up business.

MOTION to adopt the policy on “Electronic Deliberations and Voting” for the Handbook. Moved by Harding, seconded by Rivera-Servera. Minor edits to the document were accepted as friendly amendments. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

11. Website

a) The EC extends special thanks to Ken Cerniglia for his continued assistance as Web master.

Other Business:

12. Breakout sessions

The President assigned discussion leaders to several issues and instructed EC members to divide into small groups and rotate among the leaders at intervals of ten minutes to discuss the issues. Afterward, the whole EC reviewed and expanded upon the work of the small groups. Decisions about further revisions and implementation were deferred until Sunday:

a) ASTR Member Taxonomy: Sofer. This was a document drafted by Book Review Editor Katherine Scheil of terms indicating scholarly specializations that could be keyed to members’ names in the Membership Directory and used for assigning book reviews,

finding cohorts for conference sessions, etc.

b) EC job description and calendar for the Handbook: Ferris. We began with a rough draft the Secretary compiled for the draft Handbook.

c) Future of the Newsletter: Harding. The aim here was brainstorm what to do with the Newsletter now that we have a Web site with the capability of disseminating the same information.

d) "New to ASTR" Web site description: George-Graves. The idea was to create an easily accessible section on the ASTR Web site to help those new to the Society learn about its main activities and services.

e) Future of the PhD Directory: Ramon-Servera. The discussion focused on whether we should continue this and, if so, in what form.

13. Brainstorming Session

Time was allocated for the EC to brainstorm in order to generate new business that could be taken up at the November meeting and/or that might be forwarded to an existing committee or assigned an ad hoc committee.

The ideas offered for consideration, including having a brainstorming session at this meeting, were ones that President had elicited from EC cohorts. She had asked each group of the four members who were elected in the same year to converse about topics they might like to see addressed and to report back to her. These topics were addressed in two broad categories, one for the Executive Committee, and the other for the Committee on Conferences (bulleted items are the cohort topics; indented items are the EC's response during the meeting):

a) Cohort topics for the Executive Committee:

- How to foster disciplinary openness (between theatre history and performance studies; geographic research focus; intermedia). Which constituencies should we reach out to?
- How to foster support for collaborative research models and methods?

-Should ASTR sponsor an MLA panel? There is already a drama division, but it doesn't get many submissions. It's like a little ASTR. How can we recruit via MLA?

- What are our goals for growth? Getting more members. Internationalization. Investments. Conceptual goals would be linked to what sort of members we want to attract. Collaborative research. Graduate students are a growth area.

-Administrator Erickson pointed out that ASTR has not really done any marketing; we have no brochure for our conferences, for example. We should be able to increase the number of non-members in Boston. We should develop longitudinal data as to whether we keep graduate students throughout their careers. Maybe we could offer incentives, such as getting your 25th consecutive year of membership for free. Put a new line item in the budget for advertising the conference in the Boston area. We could pursue buying/trading advertising in other conference's programs.

-Invite speakers from outside disciplines to do a keynote and use that in advertising to get people to the conference. Curate the visit—give guidelines for ourselves on how to engage the visitor.

-We can advertise ASTR at our institutions among colleagues and graduate students. We should get input from GSC on what would be the best media for advertising—electronic or paper?

-When ASTR members give talks locally at universities, they could make their ASTR affiliation visible. We could make a speakers list of who is willing to speak and on what.

-Schneider proposed a cross-fertilization initiative that would offer a \$200 honorarium.

-Career long mentoring – when you arrive at ASTR, you are assigned a mentor, and this process is meant to continue, so you become a long-term member. This mentoring should be part of the mission of the President's reception. There is room for development of the existing mentorship program.

-ASTR should encourage individual institutions to organize reunions at the conference to establish contacts across generations.

-Gendering of service responsibilities – It is challenging to get gender balance on committees. Within theatre studies, numbers of women are on the rise.

- How can we work with Cambridge UP to boost the profile of *Theatre Survey*? Get CUP to sponsor receptions at which TS would be on display, maybe along with TRI and NTQ.
- Donating memberships (e.g. senior scholars donate for graduate student or non-US based scholar). What about donating subscriptions for institutions in developing countries?

b) Cohort topics for the Committee on Conferences:

- Outreach to specific scholars

Our conference is appealing to those looking for a less anonymous organization

- Encouraging graduate student involvement

-Graduate student mock interviews – ask for advice on this from GSC and have them relay it to the Committee on Conferences.

- Encouraging wider membership involvement

-Yield of current members at our conferences - Why are only half attending? How can we find out why others aren't coming? We could put a survey on the Web site.

-Some senior scholars are not renewing their memberships; people renew with their conference registration, so if people do not attend the conference, they might not renew. Erickson wants to start renewals earlier—in June; needs to rethink this with new on-line capability. Can there be a link on the Web site: “Am I a current member?” People forget whether they have renewed or not. Can we set up auto payment? Incentive would be to get low rate.

-In conference scheduling, can we stagger Brown Bags so they don't conflict to allow members to attend more than one? Brown Bags for senior scholars - We had one in 2007: After tenure, then what? It was suggested to Mary Trotter that this be expanded.

- Wording calls for proposals; balancing the programme

-Why are people going to the conference? If there is disgruntledness because of changes in the field, we move on. Opening spots in the program that do not have to do with the theme – stressing of the theme is such that people don't know that they can propose sessions outside the theme. This should be explicitly expressed and program committee reminded of this. Should all plenaries be relevant to the theme? It is possible to have 50-60% related to theme, enough to generate conversation, but space for other topics. Some members feel that the Call for Papers does not reflect their research at their home institutions. Why don't they propose a session that does? Can the variety of issues raised in the call be increased? The best calls contain a mix of old and new.

-Are state of the profession panels fulfilling their purpose? Would it be preferable to have another plenary session that is competitively vetted? There is a sense that state of the profession panels have not always been engaging. It is so competitive to get

on plenary, why take away plenary opportunities? We could invite proposals for the state of the profession and vet them; it would be themed. The state of the profession panel could be a Working Group. It is hard to have a discussion following the state of the profession panel because so many positions are staked out. It is best to leave the format for the state of the profession panel to the conference chair; s/he should decide whether it should be a Working Group or plenary. We may not need to have a state of the profession panel every year.

- Encouraging journal editors to attend

- Sessions on the theatre history survey course; books and promotion standards

-What about those who are going to the conference to learn how to be better teachers of theatre? Teaching theatre history survey course – can this be a plenary/ state of the profession session? Ideas have already developed in the ongoing Working Group. It might be timely to bring this to the larger conference.

- Politically progressive research

-Good work engages conversations that are taking place around the academy. But big tent approach is important. We do not want to send a message that there are only certain types of scholarship.

- Funding attendees

-Can we create a budget line whereby Working Group chairs can get funding for scholars from abroad who could not otherwise attend? This will become part of the budget discussion on Sunday.

- The role of performance within presentations

-This was raised in the Vice President's report. What about the relationship between Working Groups and performance? Performance in that context would need to be performance as research, which is not a fun way of smuggling performance into the conference. This is a fraught topic that deserves real conversation. Send feedback to Vice President Knowles.

- Increasing the number of social occasions

MOTION TO ADJOURN until Sunday morning. Moved by Rivera-Servera, seconded by Schnieder. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. The meeting adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

SUNDAY 16 MARCH

President Davis called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

The President announced that the next EC meeting will be Thursday 6 November in Boston. We will meet all day; the conference starts at 4:00. Part of our meeting will be devoted to a fund raising workshop. EC members need to arrive on Wednesday. The Spring 2009 EC meeting will be in April in Evanston.

1. Budget

Much of the morning was devoted to further discussion of budget priorities aired on Saturday. With general agreement on the need for fee increases (except for graduate student fees) and on the principle that dues would be raised more than conference registration, various funding scenarios were proposed and weighed with respect to the following items (dollar amounts indicate ranges supported by the EC):

International and National Scholars Travel (\$1000-2000)
Free drink at Reception (\$0-3,000, depending on sponsorship)
Fundraising Campaign (\$2700)
Fall EC Meeting Hotel Costs for GSC Representative (\$200)
Full coverage of Spring Meeting Hotel for EC (\$2300)
Coverage of Extra Hotel Night for EC for Fall Meeting (\$2000-4000)
Web site (maintenance, upgrade, ongoing service charge: \$5000)
Carbon Offsets (\$1000)
Archives (maintenance at U of Maryland: \$1700)
Conference Publicity (\$250-1000; could just be design fee)

Treasurer Nellhaus is increasing the conference budget by \$8000-9000 to cover the rise in costs.

If the fund raising campaign is successful, and the stock market does not tank, we will be drawing Fellowships and Awards more from interest on endowment, so there will be more in our expense account to cover these items. This gives us some leeway if we look at the budget over three years.

MOTION: To instruct the Treasurer to draw up a budget based upon line items in their current ranges and to show us what that would mean in terms of dues and fees. The proposal is to be circulated after meeting and voted on by e-mail. Moved by Ziter, seconded by Sofer. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. New rates will be reflected in conference registration for this fall.

2. Follow-up on Business from Saturday

a) Taxonomy

The EC workshopped a draft compiled by Ted Ziter. This will be incorporated as part of the Membership Directory. There will be a key, and people will be instructed to choose the terms that best fit their work. There should be a caveat with the key: "If you don't see your category listed, contact ___" The President will charge a subcommittee with refining this and circulating it to the EC again before it is implemented.

b) EC Handbook Description

The EC workshopped a draft compiled by Lesley Ferris. The President will charge a subcommittee with refining this, creating a calendar section, and circulating it to the EC again before it is pasted into the Handbook.

c) Recurring Categories for ASTR's News

The EC workshopped a document prepared by James Harding from the template Dennis Beck has been using for the Newsletter. The categories should be expanded to include the GSC.

There are several options for disseminating ASTR's news: 1) Patron Mail (send an electronic mailing to the membership. The Publications Committee would need to find a new Newsletter Editor.); 2) Incorporate the previous Newsletter into the Web site (hire a Web master, e.g., Michael Nat, who has a background in theatre and has worked under four editors of *Theatre Survey*); 3) Use an e-mail newsfeed.

The Publications Committee's assumption is that the days of the Newsletter are coming to an end, and it is best to work toward a Web-based news system. If we reverted to using only the Web site, someone (e.g., Michael Nat) would edit for content. We need a Web Master and content editor. Administrator Nancy Erickson could do some of this work; we would need to adjust her fees accordingly. Harding was advised also to canvas the GSC for expertise. If news is posted on the Web site, we would need a mechanism for letting the membership know what's new. The University of Maryland would regularly need to download Web content for archiving. We could still commission special newsletter for special events. In a straw poll, two-thirds of the EC was in favor of moving toward a Web-based dissemination of ASTR's news.

The Publications Committee was charged with exploring this and bringing us reasonable scenarios, not to preclude a full cover concept of a Newsletter if an editor can be found. The total budget of all Web work should be within an upper limit of \$5000.

d) New to ASTR

The EC workshopped a draft compiled by Nadine George-Graves. The President will charge a subcommittee with refining this and reporting back to her and the Secretary before it is sent to Ken Cerniglia for posting on the Web site.

Some comments were made about how to make this and other information more accessible to newcomers on the Web site: The EC expressed liking how fast it currently loads; if we add flash, etc. it will slow it down. Funding and Awards should be accessible under both Benefits of Membership and its own headline. Can there be a more visible link to Member News, so that newcomers can see what members are working on? The EC was ambivalent about a section listing other organizations: on the one hand, this would be useful; on the other, we should be cautious about naming the competition.

e) PhD Directory

The EC workshopped a document prepared by Ramon Rivera-Servera. Several points were raised in discussion: Graduate students use the Directory heavily. What are the right and wrong labor inputs for us, given Web development since ASTR created the PhD Directory? Keeping one's own program Web site updated is huge amount of work, which doubles if one has to do it in multiple places. So we are not likely to get a good response from Directors of Graduate Studies to do separate updates for us. A strong argument for simply listing links to programs' Web sites is that it is not ASTR's job to standardize other institutions' information. Graduate students should be expected to do their own Web research on programs. In listing links, it would be very important to include international programs, e.g., in England. We could create a list of criteria for inclusion based on what programs do, e.g., performance studies emphasis, interdisciplinarity, etc. GSC Representative Anderson agreed that a list of links would be a much appreciated service. She added that there would not be a huge outcry if the old format was abandoned. In a straw poll, the EC was unanimously in favor of moving to a link format for the PhD Directory. The President will assign a subcommittee to formulate further recommendations for EC consideration.

MOTION TO ADJOURN by Ferris, seconded by Knowles. The motion was unanimously approved: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. The meeting adjourned to applause on schedule, promptly at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kim Marra, ASTR Secretary

Minutes of the 2008 Spring ASTR EC Meeting-- PAGE 5