



Tuesday, January 14, 2020 | 11:30 a.m. - 1:30 p.m. EST  
Zoom Meeting

### **Approved Minutes**

**Present:** Laura Collins, President; Kendall King, 1<sup>st</sup> VP; Patsy Duff, 2<sup>nd</sup> VP; Linda Harklau, Past President; Glenn Martinez, Treasurer (excused for early departure); Charlene Polio, Member-At-Large; Naoko Taguchi, Member-At-Large (excused for late arrival); Nicole Deschene for James Coda, GSC Representative; Sarah Berke, Ex Officio; Jessica Atkinson, Ex Officio; and Fabiola Ehlers-Zavala, Secretary.

**Excused:** Christina Higgins, Member-At-Large; and James Coda, GSC representative.

President Laura Collins called the meeting to order at around 11:34 a.m. She offered welcoming remarks and wished a *Happy New Year* to everyone.

#### **Approval of the Agenda.**

A motion to approve the agenda was offered by Kendall King.

Laura turned to Sarah with a request to list the amendments to the agenda. Sarah proceeded to list the changes, including the following: postponing the discussion of the very detailed GSC report to March 2020; moving the discussion of the changes to the Standing Rules earlier in the agenda; and moving the discussion of the FFAL earlier in the agenda as well.

#### **Approval of the October 2019 minutes.**

This item got postponed for an e-vote/approval as Fabiola was seeking clarification on a few items she had not quite captured. Some EC members also noted that the minutes needed some editions/revisions.

#### **Governance.**

Bylaws revision. Laura noted that the report reflected the conversation in October 2019. Meeting participants were directed to look at File #3, which contained the proposed revisions to the Bylaws. It was noted that members would receive notice of the proposed changes in March.

Discussion unfolded around the expenses of the Past President when attending the EC meetings. It was noted that AAAL would cover those expenses (i.e., air and hotel) if the Past President chose to attend the meetings. Funding would be addressed in the revision of the



Standing Rules, not the Bylaws. It was clarified that the Past President would be invited, but this director would not be required to attend the EC meetings. Once the discussion on the proposed revisions to the Bylaws concluded, there was a motion to approve the revisions.

**A motion to approve the revision to the Bylaws was made by Glenn Martinez. The motion passed by unanimous vote of the members participating in the meeting.**

Compliments for the nice work on the Bylaws were offered to Sarah Berke.

### Standing Rules Revisions

Laura proceeded to offer some background on this item. Sarah delivered this report. On the topic of length of service, it was noted that committee members would serve for three years. No motion was introduced as the items on revisions to the Standing Rules were adopted by consensus.

### FFAL Discussion (File #10).

Glenn took the lead in highlighting aspects of the report submitted by Tom Ricento, FFAL Chair and Trustee. Please, refer to File #10. Glenn noted that he was pleased with the work of the trustees. He noted that there had been a discussion in September with Hamilton to go over the status of the two endowment funds. Then, Glenn noted that the conversation changed to the topic of fundraising.

Glenn noted, as reflected in the report, that “the committee decided at its January 7, 2020 meeting that the entire \$30,000 Marriott Hotel settlement be deposited in a new segregated account designated the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion award fund; investment income from that segregated named fund will be used exclusively to support graduate student travel to the annual conference.”

He also noted that concern had been raised regarding the fact that this should not be lumped together with other awards. The FFAL would therefore oversee three funds:

- The General Fund
- The Wilga Rivers Fund
- DEI Award Fund

The projected revenue was estimated to be \$1K per year, and it was noted that there would be a better return if all went into one account. There was conversation on the “symbolic” vs. the “economic argument.”



Glenn noted that it would be great if there were a way to leave the money all in one place but divide it to have a separate fund per award. Kendall asked if there were fees with separate accounts, and Laura replied that we had not been paying any additional fees, noting that if we were to be assessed fees, it would be on the total portfolio, not on separate accounts. Patsy added that if we were growing the funds, then we would need to report on that. Laura expressed some level of discomfort with the separation.

On the topic of separate funds, Charlene expressed appreciation for the idea of separate awards, and reminded us that we had agreed that the \$30K would go to a separate fund. Glenn noted that it was his perception that the trustees wanted it to be differentiated. Linda asked the hypothetical of what would happen in a down economic year. Glenn suggested the need to issue provisions in the standing rule (e.g., when there are no dividends in a given year...). Kendall then asked the opposite question: “What if the award grows?” Sarah explained that the FFAL fund is a donor-restricted fund. Sarah also expressed discomfort with the assumption that the fund could generate \$1K a year. The discussion continued, and Sarah mentioned that the discretion of where the funds are invested and how they are used lies with the EC. At this point, Linda noted that donors can do restricted donations, and Sarah responded in the affirmative indicating that we could set up a separate account. Then, participants were directed to File 10d. There was more discussion on whether or not students can self-declare their (DEI) status. Sarah noted that this point is being gathered during data collection. A question on the criteria also emerged. Sarah noted that it was for people who were from diverse backgrounds. Glenn noted that this award could be received one time. Other questions also emerged in the context of graduate students and international scholars. Glenn noted that the trustees were adamant that the award should remain a student-focused award. Laura sought clarification on the timeline to approve all this, and Sarah indicated that we would approve it in March. Laura also reminded us that we needed to think about the targeted population, which impacts criteria and mechanisms for adjudication. Jessica noted that we didn’t want to have to think about having to define “diversity” (in terms of who is/is not eligible). Kendall noted that “it is about the person [not topic of study].” Laura wondered if we would ask the FFAL to prioritize “the person” or “the researcher.” Linda noted that, regardless of criteria, someone is likely to feel excluded.

There was also a discussion on when awards would be announced. An action item for Glenn was to ask the FFAL to come up with guidelines for adjudication within the GSC. Patsy noted the importance of figuring out how the implementation would unfold (“the devil is in the details”). No motion was needed on any of this.

An expression of thanks was conveyed to Glenn for his work, and then Glenn asked if the EC wanted to approve the Standing Rule on the FFAL (10a). **This action got postponed.**



(At this time, Sarah raised a concern with time as 90 minutes were left for the meeting.)

**Operations.**

File #6. GSC Award for Service in relation to Diversity.

Nicole delivered the GSC report, directing the EC to Appendix D, highlighting revisions/changes to their previous work/document on the description and nomination process. (This was intended to support diversity, and it would be for either service or research).

Laura provided participants with an opportunity to ask Nicole questions. Kendall asked who would review applications and make those decisions. Nicole said that they had not discussed that. She assumed it would be the diversity sub-co., but she did not want to confirm without first checking with them.

Laura noted that the GSC really took the advice given. She reiterated the need to know who would adjudicate the proposals. It appeared to Laura that the rest of the EC did not have further issues. Kendall asked if there was a need to stipulate that recipients could not receive another award within the same year. She raised concerns with what appeared to be a very long timeline.

Laura asked if the EC needed to approve it. Sarah responded affirmatively, noting that the EC grants this authority for the GSC to administer the award.

Laura asked for a motion with the understanding that modification was to follow (adjudication and timeline).

**Kendall made a motion to consider approval of the award. All EC members approved the motion unanimously.**

Patsy commented that this was easier to adjudicate than the other piece coming from the FFAL. She did ask the question of whether or not there was an overlap.

Laura noted that there was, as we were considering the approval of two diversity awards for the graduate students.

Linda asked if this was for accepted presentations. Linda noted that the timeline needed to be worked out. This had implications for the work going into preparing for the convention. Kendall indicated this would be better as a brown-bag luncheon/presentation to avoid intersecting with the adjudication process. Nicole appreciated the suggestion.



Laura noted the redundancy with the FFAL award. The discussion continued as EC members were seeking clarification on details related to the adjudication (i.e., for an accepted presentation, etc.). Additional questions on logistics came up and Fabiola suggested giving this task of clarification/review to the trustees, noting that maybe the GSC had already done the work for the trustees.

Then, Laura asked Nicole for her thoughts, and Nicole indicated that the “diversity” aspect was a priority. Nicole volunteered some thoughts, but there was no firm recommendation.

At this time, Laura turned to Glenn and asked him if he thought we should share this document with the FFAL. She noted that maybe we were talking about the same award. (Glen was gone during this point in the discussion.)

Kendall expressed support for having one award and one system--a powerful award that is well-funded and well-publicized. Laura indicated that this would be a great opportunity for the GSC and the FFAL to collaborate.

Laura offered Nicole assistance for anything they may need (action/support).

Sarah turned to Fabiola to ask if we had approval for this. Fabiola noted that we had already approved the students to work on the award. She noted the question now was whether this would be what the FFAL would adopt for *their* award.

Sarah raised concerns in the event the FFAL did not go for it. Sarah suggested holding off on the approval of the award until March. There were other options presented. Issues were further raised by other EC members regarding the duplication/adjudication problem.

It was noted that two bodies had different, but similar purposes: They are both serving grad students, and they both put forward two awards. The question was raised as to the one we wished to pursue as it may be worth taking one off the table. Sarah noted we could go back to the FFAL and indicate that our preference was to go with the GSA’s.

Laura wondered about how the FFAL would react after all the work they put into it. Sarah noted she felt James had already shared this with the FFAL, but she cautioned that maybe the FFAL did not register the fact that James had said it.

Linda suggested asking the FFAL to consider how these two awards could merge. She noted that that conversation needed to happen.



Charlene felt it would be better to have it with the FFAL based on the higher amount that could be given by them.

Laura would ask the FFAL to work with the GSC and ask for a concrete proposal for March.

Kendall agreed with this discussion and, given the gaps in the FFAL proposal, to encourage them to consider the piece from the GSC.

The question was who would communicate all that to the FFAL. Laura suggested having Glenn to do so. Sarah (at that moment, as the meeting was unfolding) emailed Glenn to give him a heads up and to keep him from further communicating with the FFAL until Laura talked to him. Sarah took this action item down (Laura and Glenn to connect for Glenn to be prepared to chat with the FFAL).

It was, consequently, decided that this would be an item for Glenn to share with the FFAL. Sarah recommended holding off on the approval of this until March. It was noted that it appeared that two awards had a different but similar purpose. Then, the question of whether or not the FFAL was aware of all this (i.e., the GSC award) was raised. Nicole noted that it would be an FFAL award.

At this point, it was noted that Laura was to talk to Glenn to give him a summary of this conversation. (Glenn had signed off at 1:15 p.m.)

Laura noted that the next item for discussion could be postponed until March.

Then, the topic of under-attended sessions was introduced, but it was agreed that its discussion would be postponed. At this time, Charlene asked if the grids would be distributed. Charlene noted that sometimes people attend presentations by authors that are better known. Laura will submit this item as part of her leadership report at the March meeting (Charlene to help Laura). She (Laura) was interested in creating a buzz around presentations.

Sarah suggested an email discussion (even before March) including Jessica and Kendall, as something may be possible with the App or Confex. Kendall expressed interest in being included in this conversation.

(We are out of order.)

The EC moved to discuss File #8 (Conference Survey Report).  
File #8. Conference Survey Report.



Laura wanted more people doing the survey so that the survey could tell us something meaningful.

EC members were asked to refer to the Excel file (question #5—the stats generated by Survey Monkey noting that those percentages were calculated by the number of respondents as opposed to those who attended the event). The following was noted as a problem: “Stats do not tell us what we need to know.” (Laura to look at this with Jessica.) The question of how we could motivate more people to answer the survey was raised. Laura consulted with her colleagues who indicated that raffles and prizes was not the way to go. The following suggestions were provided:

- Give concrete examples to the participants on how results inform decisions made by AAAL.
- Have reminders shared via the App.
- Have the help of volunteers and session chairs to fill them out.
- Gamification to create a sense of competition within people filling out the survey—adhering to a group.

Patsy offered the following suggestion/question: “Is there a way to include feedback about the event as part of the app? In real-time feedback about the event?” It was noted that survey needs to come out sooner, not a week later. Linda asked if we could use a QR code. Jessica noted that we had one for the FFAL, and that may create some confusion (caveat presented).

Linda talked about the fact that some people may face some challenges with the App as they may not be very comfortable/proficient with the it.

Laura indicated interest in discussing ideas like those with Jessica and Kendall to come up with a plan for this conference and continue to build it in upcoming years.

File #7. AAAL Communities.

Sarah delivered this report. It was noted that there had been a first discussion on this a while ago. She noted that Charlene and Naoko worked with Sarah as well as with Carolin’s involvement. She (Sarah) would like to roll it in March. This was intended to be a true on-line community concept.

Sarah did not walk us through the proposal as it had been done in October, so the opportunities to ask questions was given.



Kendall asked who would do the work. Sarah noted that the On-line and Outreach Co. would supervise the work and would provide a lot of support to the Co. Chair. There would be a Chair for each community. (The committee was not going to be heavily managing the Communities if they had other priorities.) It was also pointed out that, in order for the community to exist, there had to be a Chair.

Several questions followed, including whether this would be in the form of a digest and whether or not this would be open to non-members. Linda asked for a grace period for non-members. The committee considered the idea of being open to non-members, but Sarah advised against this idea, noting that it should remain a member privilege. Sarah was OK with a grace period. Laura asked if we could do both to get people hooked (as the strategy others use to get people interested in becoming members). Sarah was not sure if we could do it, but she said that some communities could be open to non-members. It was noted that there were security issues to consider. EC members liked this idea. The Co. for On-line and Outreach could choose which ones could be open v. locked. (Pick 3!)

Linda offered additional comments in support of this idea.

Sarah asked for approval as the next step with the note that it did have a cost (\$3,500/year already budgeted).

**Linda made a motion to approve the proposal to enact the AAAL Communities. All members present approved it unanimously.**

#### File #9. AILA Report.

Fabiola delivered this report. Charlene asked why it was our turn to pay. Fabiola noted that she indicated previously we had been asked to consider hosting the AILA group, but that there were no clear criteria or patterns as to why we were being asked this time to host. Fabiola offered background as noted in the files provided accompanying her report. Fabiola noted that AILA did not ask AAAL to host AILA members at the Conference hotel. Fabiola shared her experience with AILA as to where she had experienced the meetings—modest venues. Fabiola presented different options / questions to consider and to ensure the EC thought about that and decided if we could participate at this time. (Sarah offered an update from Ellen, and she presented other alternatives to consider.) Charlene asked for the estimated number of AILA participants. Sarah noted that it would be for about 12 people. Kendall did the math, and she suggested some additional ideas for negotiation. Some members were concerned about the cost and continued to wonder why AILA wanted to come to the US. It was pointed out that AILA participants made their own reservations by connecting with the POC that we would provide. There was no expectation to comp the conference fee registration. Following the discussion as





well as questions and answers about the history of AAAL's involvement with AILA (e.g., Susan Gass being a founder, so AAAL had a major involvement in the formation of AILA), it was agreed that AAAL would support hosting the AILA colleagues in Houston 2021. Laura asked the question as to whether this was a time to reconsider the relationship, but both Kendall and Linda responded by saying that maybe this was not the best time to walk away, and suggested that we should think about it very carefully. In the end, it was agreed that Fabiola would communicate the AAAL support for hosting AILA members in Houston, indicating that we were still trying to address the logistics to make it feasible (cost-effective). We would suggest considering having the meetings at the back end of the conference—pitching the idea that members could also attend TESOL Intl. The idea of having a social event of some kind with them to nurture the relationship was also entertained.

Fabiola also mentioned the invitation she had received from the VP to consider running for election. Fabiola noted it made sense to be involved to influence change. She expressed she was game for it if AAAL wanted to have more involvement. Fabiola noted she needed to do more research regarding expectations (cost, number of meetings a year, etc.). She noted that AILA was extending an invitation for us to be more involved with them.

Laura summarized our agreement to host in a cost-effective way, and asked Fabiola by when she'd need an answer from the EC. Fabiola noted that March would be a good time to decide.

Fabiola would report back to AILA.

Laura proceeded to cover other items:

- Workshops: Kendall noted that we needed an on-site rate for registration—potentially \$50.

**Motion to have the on-site registration at \$50 was introduced by Linda. All members were in favor.**

- It was agreed that AAAL would pay for the grad student's lunch as they don't have conference registration comp (only the GSC steering committee does).
- File #11. Diversity Report.

Laura asked Fabiola to consider following-up via email. It was agreed that Fabiola would circle back with the EC in February to seek input on the template for the Diversity discussion during the General Business Meeting in March. (A draft for discussion at this meeting had been provided).



- Then, there was a brief discussion on the AAAL Briefs (Netta had asked if the Briefs could be put on the website). It was noted that the Briefs would remain as a pilot project and because the AAALetter lives on our website, by default, so do the Briefs. There was agreement that they Briefs would not live on the website separately. Laura was to communicate with Netta regarding this outcome: “The Brief would not be made available separately on the website, noting that they could be cited/accessed via the AAALetter.”

Sarah proceeded to engage in a review of action items.

#### Action Items:

1. Laura to communicate with Carolin about the consensus to proceed with sub-committee model;
2. Sarah to write the amendments to support the sub-committee structure;
3. Sarah to set a separate account with Fidelity—donor restricted funds; begin mechanism for collection;
4. Laura to communicate with Glenn regarding the discussion around GSC Diversity Award;
5. Glen to communicate with FFAL about the GSC Award;
6. Laura and Charlene to work with Jessica and Kendall to offer recommendations about ways of encouraging participation at sessions with a potential risk of low attendance;
7. Laura to work with Jessica to discuss strategies to improve participation in conference survey;
8. Sarah to implement the communities’ infrastructure;
9. Sarah to proceed with securing sleeping rooms for AILA in Houston;
10. Sarah to work on the recommendations for revisions to the Bylaws;
11. Laura to communicate with Netta on the Briefs discussion;
12. Fabiola to continue the conversation on Diversity (template);
13. Fabiola to revise the October minutes;
14. Sarah to communicate with the GSC on the meal waiver for the sub-committee.

Laura thanked everyone. Patsy congratulated Naoko on the new job at NAU. Naoko offered some comments regarding her move to AZ.

The meeting was adjourned at around 1:30 p.m.



Prepared by F. Ehlers-Zavala, Secretary

Submitted for EC review on March 4, 2020

Re-submitted for Sarah to upload and EC to review on March 18, 2020

Remarks:

- Approved \_\_\_\_\_
- Approved with editions: \_\_\_\_\_
- Approved on (Date): March 26, 2020