

Performance studies business meeting
CSCA 2021

Secretary:

Those present: Tami spry, Jake Simmons, Meggie mapes, Travis Brisini, Molly Cummins, Jennnifer Tuder, Christopher collins, Benjamin Myers, Raquel Polanco, Tasha Dunn, Shelby Swafford, Tony Adams, Diana woodhouse, Aaron Burton

- Travis opens with a welcome. There is no “carry-over business” but there are updates to share with the interest group.
- Travis moves to approve the minutes for 2020 –
 - Motion to second: Meggie moves to approve
 - Tasha seconds
- Introductions for all present
- Elections: Travis calls for nomination. Tasha Dunn is nominated and Tash accepts the nomination. She is unanimously voted into the secretary position
- Membership number update: as of this morning, we have 75 people in the interest group. There are approximately 8-10 lifetime members. We have been growing our numbers successfully. We need to keep getting submissions and all participate. Moving to autoethnography has been a good move to allow interest. We are in the clear with continuing to exist.
- Top paper award winner announcement:
 - Award panel on Thursday morning at 8 a.m. and walked through the 2020-2021 awards.
 - Winner of the performance studies and autoethnography debut paper: was Kari Pink from the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
 - The top competitive paper award was Karly Pointer for the University of Memphis
 - No nominee for this year’s outstanding book in performance studies or autoethnography
 - Outstanding article in autoethnography was won by Tasha Dunn and Ben Myers
 - Outstanding article in performance studies was won by Travis Brisini
 - Outstanding scholar in performance studies and autoethnography for 2021 was Jake Simmons.
- Remaining conference panel conventions are mentioned and Travis reminds about the key panels for the remainder of the day.
- Travis opens the floor to discussion. There are 3 items for discussion:
 - Adjustments to the bylaws:
 - Currently, if you want to make an adjustment, you. Have to send the proposed adjustments to the interest group 30 days within 30 days of the convention. We have not achieved this a single time. This has been unsuccessful. Travis suggests that we remove this 30-day mandate.

Instead, Travis proposes that adjustments can bring proposed changes to the floor during the business meetings.

- Tami supports the motion and there is unanimous support.
- In the process of awards, the current book award is structured as an alternating cycle: performance studies and autoethnography every-other-year. In practice, this has been too strict and reduced submissions. Travis proposes eliminating these conditions and move to “outstanding book award in performance studies and autoethnography” and allow any book to be nominated on an annual basis. Travis opens the floor for discussion. The proposal is supported.
 - Jennifer Tudor notes that it’s possible that 2 books can be published in the same year. Is it possible to give 2 awards? Travis reminds that any book published in the past 5 years qualifies for the award.
- Travis asked about dialing back the frequency of the outstanding scholar award. Right now, it’s technically offered every year, and because our numbers are smaller, if we offer it every year, it could reduce the legitimacy. Instead, we could move toward a more incremental approach.
 - Jake Simmons adds that we should allow it to stay every year even if we don’t award it. If there is no nomination, then we don’t move forward with the award.
 - Chris Collins seconds Jake’s observations.
 - Tami Spry also supports keeping the award annually. She notes that moving to an incremental approach can increase confusion about when the award is offered.
 - Travis moves to table the discussion until next year. The interest group accepts that, even offered, the award may not be given out every year. The award description will be changed to note that outstanding nominations will be accepted but not necessarily awarded.
 - Ben Myers asks if there are qualifications for the award, and suggests that the bylaws could be changed to reflect a higher threshold. Travis notes that the only qualification is that the scholar has made a “significant contribution” to performance studies in central.
 - Jake suggests that we trust the. Nomination letters. If the letters make a strong case and the committee believes in the significance of those letters, then we can trust that process.
- Do we need an award subcommittee?
 - In the national organization, there is a committee that’s tasked with determining the awards which can insulate the group from negative perception. Travis proposes a 3 person sub-committee.
 - Tasha asks if there are specific awards or does it also include top papers?

- Travis clarifies that there is no connection between the reviewer scores and the award's given. This move would help codify some legitimacy into the awards, and when people win them, they know that they were evaluated by a range of people.
 - Jake: select the book, articles in both areas, top paper, and outstanding scholar?
 - Jen Tudor notes that this is a substantial amount of work with both selection and evaluation.
 - Travis suggests that one member of the executive committee oversees and organizes the sub-committee. He also clarifies that, often, there is not a huge influx of competitive papers.
 - Jake notes that our executive committee is representative of the body of our interest group and trusts our leadership to make those decisions, especially because we vote in the members of the executive committee. Ben Myers agrees.
 - Tasha Dunn proposes that we maintain as is.
 - Travis reminds that self-nominations are accepted and encourages the interest group participants to self-nominate.
 - The interest group supports leaving the award selection to remain as-is.
- Update on interest group conference slots
 - 7 panels and slots were given for this year
 - Travis is hopeful that, if the system is maintained, that we ramp up our number of submissions because submissions dictate how many slots are allocated.
 - Molly provides an update on next year's conference. The theme is "reconnect." The word "reconnect" draws on images of recollect or re-collect. What can we re-collect the pieces of our lives after things have fallen apart? She encourages members to put ideas in the chat or to unmute to think through ideas.
 - Tasha Dunn shares a suggestion about making connections between interest groups. There are opportunities for co-sponsored panels.
 - Tami notes that she hopes that we can discuss what this means for the "doing" of performance studies and thinking through what we've gained or lost. How were our stories told or retracted? How were our stories visible or unseen? What has this meant for the doing of performance?
- General discussion around ECA
 - The members discuss what we can do to support the interest group
 - Jen Tudor reminds that fewer and fewer people have travel resources and some conferences are not allowing digital conference submissions. She suggests that Molly raise questions at the business meeting about allowing virtual participation may be necessary. Jen also notes that this is a larger access/accessibility question.
- Jake thanks Travis for his work and commitment to the interest group. He reminds that Travis has been integral to the betterment of the interest group.
- Meggie moves to adjourn. The motion is seconded by Diana.