

Meeting of NASSPDA Board on September 21st, 2008

MINUTES:

Conference call meeting started on Sunday, September 21st, 2008, at ~8:45 PM EDT.
In attendance: Sonja Furiya, Richard Lamberty (co-chair), Winter Held, Pat Hogan, & Benjamin Soencksen (secretary)
Apologies: Barbara Zoloth (co-chair & treasurer), & Citabria Phillips

The following agenda was posted on Sept. 16th, 2008, with additions on Sept. 17th:

A. Standing Items:

1. Confirm any online polls since last meeting
2. Approve Minutes from last meeting, held on August 24th, 2008

B. Old Business:

1. Report on the 5-Boro-Dance-Challenge, held on August 23rd, 2008
2. Discuss second draft of proposed logo design
3. Sanctioning of an LA event

C. Committee Reports:

1. Membership Committee
2. Board & Election Committee
3. Non-Profit status (currently handled by Barbara Zoloth)

D. New Business:

1. Interim Report (drafted by Winter Held)
2. Discuss cancellation of VQDC

A. Standing Items:

to A. 1. & 2.: Minutes & Notes 080824: Approved

B. Old Business:

to B.1.:

The 5-Boro-Dance-Challenge, held in New York City, was well perceived by all participants. But the number of participants was much lower than last year, its first year, and this combined with the cancellation of the Vancouver Queer Dance Classic, to be held on September 27th, 2008, spurred a discussion on what causes the “lack of interest,” and what NASSPDA could do to change that. Making the social aspect of partner dancing the main attraction of an event might be the key to increase participation. It was suggested that NASSPDA could organize an annual same-sex dance festival similarly to IAGLCWDC’s (International Association of Gay/Lesbian Country Western Dance Clubs, also referred to as “Iglwigl”) annual convention. In summary, it was agreed that this is a very important issue to NASSPDA. This discussion will be continued.

to B. 2.:

A 2nd logo design of was presented to the Board in August by Robert Soencksen. The general consensus was that it is missing movement and elegance. In order to give some more guidance, the Board will search for samples deemed more in this direction.

to B.3.:

NASSPDA had been in touch with a group in Los Angeles, who would like NASSPDA to sanction a new event. The Board is awaiting further communication from this group.

C. Committee Reports:

to C.1.:

At the time of this meeting, the “Membership Committee” had not yet convened.

to C.2.:

The “Board & Elections Committee” had presented to the board a draft of “Board Governance Policy,” which had been discussed at the previous meeting. Certain paragraphs had been and are still postponed, because of time limitations.

To C.3.:

At the previous meeting, the first steps of NASSPDA to file as a non-profit corporation had been taken. No progress report as of yet!

D. New Business:

to D.1.:

An “Interim Report” (progress report) of the work done so far by NASSPDA had been presented prior to this meeting. The terms “sanctioned event” and “authorized titles” are somewhat unclear, will be revised, and a request for recipients to forward this report to other interested parties that might not be on NASSPDA’s e-mail list will be added. After approval of a revised draft, the report will be e-mailed as well as posted on NASSPDA’s website.

to D.2.:

see “to B.1.”

The meeting adjourned on Sunday, September 21st, 2008, at ~9:55 PM EDT. The next meeting (conference call) is scheduled for Sunday, November 16th, 2008, at 8:30 PM EDT.

A conversation, after the meeting had adjourned, brought up two issues to be added to next meeting’s agenda:

1. Should it be part of NASSPDA’s Sanctioning Policies to require organizers of sanctioned events to submit copies of the resulting scores to NASSPDA after the event?

Should NASSPDA, along with this, start to establish a list of judges, which have judged same-sex events, and how many times?