This annual report covers the period of section activity from **September 2019 to August 2020** and a fiscal year from **January 2020 to December 2020**.

### Section Governance
Provide details of your section’s governance activity during the period between September 2019 and August 2020.

**Business Meeting**

*Copy and paste below (or attach separately) the agenda and draft/approved meeting minutes from the section business meeting which include a count of members present and summary of decisions made at this meeting.*

### ASA Section on the Sociology of Sexualities

**2020 Business Meeting Agenda**

August 10, 2020 from 10:30 am – 11:10 am (PST)/1:30 pm – 2:10 pm (EST)

https://bowdoin.zoom.us/j/95903396551?pwd=YzIxR0pZTHJBNFNPLOJZUwEwekITdz09

Passcode: 286097

Forty members were in attendance.

1. Welcome and Review of Rules for Participation (Tey Meadow)

   *TM welcomes membership present for joining the meeting. There are many issues to discuss and to ensure that everything can be addressed throughout the meeting. TM reminds the meeting attendees of the rules below. TM requests that to ensure everyone has an opportunity to speak, respondents should limit their comments to one minute.*

   - Please remain on MUTE until you are called on to speak.
   - Participants will be able to communicate to the Council in two ways:
     - You can ask your question in full in the Chat feature. Theo, who will be monitoring the chat, will read the question aloud for the appropriate Council members to answer.
     - You can request to speak during the meeting by writing “question” or “comment” in the Chat. Theo will be monitoring the queue and will call on people who would like to speak. Please remember to UNMUTE yourself before speaking and to MUTE once you have finished your comments.

2. Thank You to Outgoing Members and Welcome New Section Officers
TM thanks the outgoing and incoming committee members, particularly Carla Pfeffer for her continued leadership and service.

a. **Outgoing Council Members** (D’Lane R. Compton, Tristan Bridges), **Student Representatives** (Alithia Zamantakis, Tristen Kade), **Past-Chair** (Carla Pfeffer)

b. **New Chair** (Vrushali Patil), **Chair-Elect** (Angela Jones), **Student Representatives** (Michelle Gomez Parra, Minwoo Jung), and **Council Members** (Brandon Andrew Robinson, Greggor Mattson)

3. **Financial/Membership Report** (Theo Greene)

   *TG provides some updates. As of August 2, current membership is at 412, slightly down from 2019. This is great considering that there was no physical meeting (when we likely see a sharp increase in membership renewals. The section is not in trouble except the 500-membership threshold, which keeps our hopes for a section alive. ASA will use the membership numbers based on 2019 to determine the slots allotted to us for next year’s meeting if we cannot exceed that number for 2020.*

   Next year’s section day is August 10, the last day of the conference.

   *In terms of financial, the section has $2672, which reflects the $1600 donated to MFP, but does not reflect expenses from awards this year nor the $1000 earmarked for the report still pending relating to the preconference. Given all of this, we will end with a surplus of $1216.*

   After soliciting questions, of which there were none, TG turned the meeting over to TM.

4. **Award Presentations** (Tey Meadow)

   *TM decided to switch the initial order of Agenda Items 4 (Findings of the Awards Committee Task Force) and 5 (Awards) to ensure that the membership had an opportunity to discuss the report’s findings. TM stated that the awards this year, being presented over Zoom, seems a bit “anti-climactic,” but requests that the membership generate as much energy and positivity as possible to express congratulations to the winners.*

   *TM announces that we will feature the winners of these awards in our annual newsletter, due that we are unable to expend time during this important meeting to describe these projects.*

   *TM announced the awards: Best Book Award, the Distinguished Article Award, the Martin P. Levine Dissertation Award, the Best Graduate Student Paper Award, the Early Career Award, and the Simon and Gagnon Lifetime Achievement Award, which will be awarded in 2021 with a panel on the career of Gloria Gónzalez-Lopez.*

   *TM thanked the committee for soliciting the award nominations and reviewing these nominations carefully.*

5. **Discussion of findings of Awards Committee Task Force** (Angela Jones)

   (SEE APPENDIX A FOR EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT).
Collective Discussion: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (Tey Meadow)

TM describes that the Section on Sexualities has had a “reckoning” in terms of diversity, equity, and inclusion within the section over the last few years. Angela Jones and Carla Pfeffer have put together a report that brings together the work that the Section has been doing in terms of these issues, and TM invites AJ to describe some of the report’s key findings. After that, TM will announce the creation of a new task force to address these issues, after which leadership will solicit ideas from the membership about things that the committee should be working on. TM turns the meeting over to AJ.

AJ begins by thanking the membership and congratulating the award winners. To preserve as much space for discussion, AJ states that the membership should have received the Executive Summary in advance of the meeting. For the sake of time, she will not get into extensive detail about the report. For those not familiar with the task force, one of the goals of the task force is “to move beyond tokenistic inclusion and membership in leadership,” and making thoughtful choices about the kind of scholarship the section values as critical to remaining at the forefront of Sociology and pushing the field forward.

This year, the committee conducted an audit of the leadership, the awards, and membership with a particular eye on racial and ethnic diversity. Looking at membership, the committee paid specific attention to gender and sexuality. AJ asked TM how much of the findings she should report. TM explained that, for the sake of time, she should only cover the overarching needs and concerns, which can help direct the feedback we receive from folks.

AJ begins reporting the findings as it pertains to leadership. The chairs of the section have disproportionately been white. In 2013, Salvador Vidal Ortiz became the first person of color ever to chair the section. For three consecutive years, Latinx people served this role. In 2019 and 2020, the section elected people of color to serve this role. Vrushali Patil is the first South Asian and the first transnational scholar in this role, while Angela Jones is the first Black chair of the section. In the section’s history, only two people of color have served as Secretary/Treasurer – Lorena Garcia and Theo Greene. The Council and student representatives have been more racially diverse. In terms of other demographics, which were more difficult to aggregate, the leadership has been overwhelmingly cisgender. There appears to be an underrepresentation of people from teaching-intensive universities and community colleges. Moving forward, as we continue this work, we need to take a look at the racial and other characteristics.

In terms of awards:

- Seven people of color and six transnational scholars have won the Best Graduate Student Paper Award. AJ mentions that it might be a bit problematic to discuss POC because it erases the underrepresentation of Black and Indigenous Scholars. Of the POC winners, Marcus Hunter has been the only Black scholar to win the Best Graduate Student Paper Award.
- For the Distinguished Article Award, six people of color and four transnational scholars have won. Of the POC winners, only two black winners of the Distinguished Article Award.
- No Indigenous winners in any category, but AJ is quick to point out that there are no Indigenous members in the Section.
• POCs won the Book Award, five transnational scholars; however, no Black person has ever won.
• The Levine Dissertation Award: 7 POC has won, five transnational scholars, with 0 Black winners.
• Although the Early Career Award is relatively new, no BIPOC person has won.
• With Simon and Gagnon, until 2020-2021, no POC has been selected to win the award. Gloria Gonzalez-Lopez is the first.
• In terms of gender, the Levine Dissertation Award is the only award committee that has award a trans or non-binary scholar. The section has also never given an award to a transfeminine scholar, which is deeply troubling. Sexualities have the highest representation of trans and non-binary scholars than any other section in ASA. We need to look at what type of scholars we are valuing, what types of scholars we are holding up, and which ones we are not.

Regarding membership:
• Our section has the highest number of trans and non-binary scholars in the entire ASA.
• Other data provide comparative analysis when comparing to other sections.
• The major takeaway is that the section must develop strategies for welcoming and recruiting, supporting BIPOC scholars, and transfeminine scholars.

AJ notes that the work of this committee is not done. The Section has created the tentatively titled Sexualities Equity Committee, who will move forward with this data to make a series of recommendations to address these issues. The committee is working on an audit and analysis more immediately to evaluate the award processes to ensure equity and eliminate bias. AJ turned it back over to TM, who emphasized that AJ and CP put in a lot of work into compiling the report, and the Section is grateful.

Before opening the floor for questions, TM comments that we could spend quite a bit of time discussing how we have reached this point historically and the complexities of putting together a system that concretizes fairness. This Equity Committee is largely made up of section leadership who will spend significant time determining how to institutionalize itself and complete the audit. The Committee aims to explore a range of issues, including how we organize, how committees are composed, how awards are nominated, reviewed, and decisions are made. TM opens the floor for questions and comments as we begin to do this work.

Ghassan Moussawi identifies himself as part of the committee and echoes TM’s comments that the committee’s focus, which is chaired by AJ, is the composition of committees and reviewing how who has occupied these committees historically. He also wanted to clarify that another issue that emerged in the conversations is that transnational work remains unintelligible. The work that must be done extends beyond issues of identity but also academic support.

TG reads a comment from Alan Satinele Martino – Thinking about accessibility should be a part of this conversation, too, thinking about practices that we adopt to make our meetings more accessible.

Elizabeth Bernstein expresses gratitude for putting this committee in place. She states that several years ago, the section put together a mentorship program, and she asks what became of that, as
that should be part of supporting junior scholars of color and trans and non-binary scholars. Having served on many of these committees before, EB notes that there have not been clear criteria on selecting work meriting awards, which results in the committee chair making up rules as they come along. She believed that some of these criteria should be formalized in writing so that the selection criteria are less ad hoc each time.

AJ responds that this is part of the work of the committee. The committee will look at every single call. The first step is to consider what is missing from these calls before moving to a discussion on rubrics because every year, there are different committees with a lot of ideas about the criteria if they are using rubrics at all. The move is to critically examine these documents and standardize them – making sure that Council weighs in on these documents to ensure transparency in the calls and minimize the potential for bias as much as possible. As a point of information, GM’s discussion of committee composition also bumps into the discussion of leadership composition. People on the Council fill many of the positions on award committees. So if our leadership is disproportionately white and cisgender, that is what the committees will also look like. GM’s comments highlight the difficulties of being the lone POC or transnational scholar on the committee if there is even a POC or transnational scholar. That is on our radar and is connected to leadership.

TM invites comments about two issues. First, the issues of accessibility with the meetings. This is a big issue, and further clarification is welcome. TM invited people to email her directly, especially if people wished to remain confidential. If there is an accessibility issue that we don’t know we have, knowing about it would be helpful. In response to EB, TM states that the committees must establish rubrics at the beginning of each award season. However, the problem of rubrics is that if you want to give a certain number of points to good writing, what constitutes “good writing” may not be the same among members. TM invites those who have some experience in evaluation, especially non-bias in evaluation, to provide input. We want to amass as much expertise as possible.

In response to the mentorship issue, CP described a three-section mentorship alliance between Sexualities, Sex & Gender, and Race, Class, and Gender. The reason for allying is because we heard from mentors that they were being overtasked, essentially doing mentorship across the three sections. We thought that bringing everyone together would prove a better model. We executed it for the first time in 2019, with three distinct mentorship events to respond to critiques that some events were too formal, too informal, etc. It was a successful model that we might want to continue moving forward. We might want to shift the sections we partner with to address some of these concerns about equity, diversity, and inclusion.

TM thanked CP for those comments and mentioned that we were in the planning stages for this program this year before the physical meeting was canceled to COVID. TM suggested that the mentorship event might be something we collectively institutionalize beyond the annual meeting since we know that many cannot afford to attend. We should think about an ongoing, systematically organized matching system.

Jyoti Puri offered a round of thanks for the report. JP asked whether the full report will be available for the membership to read and examine the details, and more specifically, is there a sense of how many people of color within the section. She asks in part because of how we are staffing committees and ensuring they are diverse. One of the problems is that the same set of people of color get asked to participate multiple times because of the imperative to diversify these committees. This makes
the imperative to ensure that we are recruiting and supporting people of color more important and allowing them to see their work through the lens of sexualities and what they have to contribute.

AJ responds by saying that the Executive Summary was attached to the initial email with all the data. To capture the section’s racial demographics, about 69% of the section is white. The section is 9% Asian American (this is based on ASA categories); Multiple Selected is about 7%, Black is 5%, Hispanic-Latino is 4%, Missing/Other Identity is 1.5%, and there are no Indigenous members. There are some comparisons in the report with the other sections. We are doing better than other sections, but that should not be understood to mean we are doing well. While it is important to think about how to address equity issues in awards and membership, we also need to think about bringing people into the section who want to take on leadership roles and serve on our awards committee.

Ying-Chao Kao wanted to echo GM’s point by highlighting a traumatic moment when discussions about future topics were discussed for pre-conference meetings. When the topic of transnational sexualities was mentioned, the committee responded with silence. However, when the topic of homonormativity was raised, the committee showed more enthusiasm. It is not only representation, but it is about Empire, Emotion, and Temporality. We should move away from American-centered and Eurocentric.

TM called an end to the discussion. TM introduced Vrushali Patil as the incoming chair.

6. Introduce New Chair, Vrushali Patil (Tey Meadow)
   VP thanked TM as well as ingoing and outgoing leadership.

7. Ideas for ASA 2020 Section Sessions (Vrushali Patil)
   VP solicited ideas for next year’s sections by asking members to input their ideas in the chat due to time. VP mentioned that because our section day is the last, we do get an extra session.
   • Please use the Chat function to submit ideas for next year’s Panels.

**2021 Sexualities Sessions Suggestions**

**Rick Braatz:**
* Expressed interest in organizing one of the panels for ASA
  * Fascism and Sexualities
  * Pandemic and Sexualities
  * Queer Neoliberalisms
  * Military, War, and Sexualities
  * Corporate Sexualities
  * Fetish and Capitalism
  * Police, Police State, and Sexualities
  * Border Sexualities

**Ryan Decarsky:** [decarsky@uw.edu](mailto:decarsky@uw.edu)
Learning Sexualities: The Informal and Formal

**Jason Orne:** [jo466@drexel.edu](mailto:jo466@drexel.edu)
Trans Femme Sex

**Laurel Westbrook:** [westbrol@gvsu.edu](mailto:westbrol@gvsu.edu)
Necropolitics and Sexualities, Race, and Gender
Jason D’Amours:  
Social Movements and Sexualities

Elizabeth Bernstein: ebernste@barnard.edu  
Sexual Politics in Pandemic Times

Julia Meszaros: Julia.Meszaros@tamuc.edu  
Transnational Intimate Labor Markets

Brandy Simula: brandylsimulaphd@gmail.com  
Labor Conditions for Sociologists of Sexuality

Ghassan Moussawi:  
Sexuality Research in Unstable Times (seconded by Natalie Ingraham)

alithia zamantakis:  
Trans of Color Sexualities

Dustin Rollins: rollinsad@gmail.com  
Sexualities and Unequal Sites of Pleasure

Trenton Haltom: tmhaltom@huskers.unl.edu  
Studying Sexualities Digitally (seconded by Dustin Rollins)

John Hollister:  
Reclaiming the Local Post-Pandemic

Angela Jones:  
Trans Sexualities, Pleasure, and Power

Theo Greene:  
Empire, Emotion, and Temporality

8. Nominations for Chair-Elect and Council for 2021 (Vrushali Patil)

VP announced that we would be sending out a Google Form for folks to complete, asking membership to think about who they would like to nominate for future leadership.

9. New Business (Vrushali Patil)

- Organizing our Archives task Force
  VP announced creating a new task force charged with reviewing the section’s files since its inception, flagging important documents, and making documents for the committees. There will be a section for this on the volunteering form. It is a lot of work, but it is important for the Committee on Equity. As the volunteering form comes out, please be on the lookout.

- Reading List Working Group
  VP announced a reading list working group to create two new reading lists: Race and Sexuality and Sexualities and Transnationalism. This will be important for comprehensive exams and literature reviews. We need resources like this to ensure that
work that traditionally gets marginalized becomes easily located and accessible. There will also be space for that on the form. Look for that on the Volunteer Form.

VP solicited questions.

GM wanted to encourage graduate students to submit their ideas for committee work as well. It will be taken seriously.

TG asked to keep the topics coming through for next year’s sessions to compile the list.

VP thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting.
Meeting adjourned at 11:29 PM PST.
Minutes respectfully submitted by TCG
APPENDIX A: Taskforce to Review Section Leadership, Awards, and Membership
Members: Angela Jones and Carla Pfeffer
(*There was a third member who dropped off before we began work)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview of the Task Force:

The 2019-2020 Taskforce to Review Section Leadership, Awards, and Membership was formed to continue work that began in 2018 to ensure that our section reflects and is living up to its vocalized commitments to inclusion and transformative social justice. In 2019, the primary focus of the Taskforce was implementing changes in the language of all of our awards and nominations calls, as well as soliciting feedback from our membership about the nominations process and what they were looking for in leadership.

As a result of the task force’s efforts, the 2019 elections reflected a far more racially diverse set of candidates for Council seats and section leadership, as well as for the section award winners. While the previous taskforce made significant progress, we still needed more data regarding the history of section leadership, award winners, and membership demographics. As a task force, our goal is to move the section beyond tokenistic inclusion in membership and leadership, as well as making meaningful choices about the scholarship that our section values, which is critical to remaining at the forefront of sociology and pushing its boundaries.

Executive Summary of Findings:

The 2019-2020 Taskforce reviewed past leadership, award receipts, and the current membership of the section. Below are the most significant findings, which point to areas where the section should take action. In what follows, we offer limited prescriptive action items and instead pinpoint areas for discussion and action by Council and leadership.

*Please note: Demographic category terms herein are those used by ASA. Section data provided by ASA do not allow for intersectional descriptive analysis (e.g., gender x race). These data are limited by the fact that we do not know the various identities of many of the folks on available lists and self-identification information was not always available online.

Leadership:

- Chairs of the section have disproportionately been white. In 2013, Salvador Vidal-Ortiz became the first person of color to serve as the chair. For three consecutive years, Latinx people served in this role (2013-2016). In 2019 and 2020, the section elected people color to the chair’s position. Vrushali Patil is the first South Asian person and transnational scholar to serve, and Angela Jones is the first Black person to chair the section.
- In its history, the section has only had two people of color serve as secretary-treasurer, Lorena Garcia (2010-2013) and Theo Greene (2019-2022).
- Unlike the chair and secretary/treasurer position, the council and student representatives have been far more racially diverse.
- Concerning other demographic variables (which were more challenging to aggregate), the leadership has been overwhelmingly cisgender and there appears to be an underrepresentation of scholars from teaching-centered and community colleges in leadership.
Moving Forward:

- Ensuring that our leadership reflects a wide range of institutional contexts, gender identities, and racial diversity is critical. The leadership composes award committees, and for example, even if there are two POC on the current Council, these two people cannot and do not serve on each award committee. Without intervention, there will continue to be award committees where there are no BIPOC and in a few cases only one. Moreover, given the vital role that Council, secretaries, and chairs play in formulating section policy, organizing panels and workshops, and charting the overall direction of the section, further diversification of the section leadership is necessary.

Awards:

- **Best Graduate Student Paper Award**—there have been 23 winners from 2001 to 2019, 11 cis women, 12 cis men, 0 trans/enby/GNC, 16 white, 7 POC, and 6 transnational scholar/scholarship. Of the POC winners, Marcus Hunter (2010) is the only Black person to have won this award.

- **Distinguished Article Award**—there have been 9 winners from 2007 to 2019, 2 cis women, 7 cis men, 0 trans/enby/GNC, 3 white, 6 POC, and 4 transnational scholar/scholarship. Of the POC winners, Trevon Logan (2011) and Shawn C. McGuffey (2009) are the only Black people to have won this award.

- **Distinguished Book Award**—there have been 9 winners from 2006 to 2019, 8 cis women, 2 cis men, 0 trans/enby/GNC, 5 white, 5 POC, and 5 transnational scholar/scholarship. No Black person has ever won this award.

- **Martin P. Levine Dissertation Fellowship**—there have been 16 winners from 2004 to 2019, 6 cis women, 8 cis men, 3 trans/enby/GNC, 9 white, 7 POC, and 5 transnational scholar/scholarship. No Black person has ever won this award.

- **Early Career Award**—there has been 1 winner since 2018, a white cis woman, and 0 transnational scholar/scholarship. No BIPOC person has yet to win this award.

- **Simon-Gagnon Lifetime Achievement Award**—there have been 16 winners from 2001 to 2019, 9 cis women, 7 cis men, 16 white, 0 POC, and 0 transnational scholar/scholarship. No BIPOC person or transnational scholar has ever won this award.

Important Points:

- The Martin P. Levine Dissertation Fellowship is the only award committee that has ever given an award to a trans or non-binary scholar. The section has never given an award to a transfeminine scholar. This is especially troubling given that our section has the highest representation of trans and non-binary people than any other section in the ASA.
- While POC scholars have won section awards, in the history of the section, only three Black people have received a section award.

Moving Forward:

- The section should explore strategies to improve the diversity of nominee pools for awards, especially among the Simon-Gagnon Lifetime Achievement Award, Early Career Award, Distinguished Book Award, and the Levine Dissertation Award. There must be special emphasis placed on Black and Indigenous, as well as trans and non-binary scholars, especially transfeminine scholars.

Membership:
Gender:

- **Gender demographics overview:** Female: 269/506 (53.16%), Male: 147/506 (29.05%), Genderqueer/GNC: 50/506 (9.88%), Other: 18/506 (3.56%), Transgender: 13/506 (2.57%), Missing: 9/506 (1.78%).

Important Point:

- Sexualities had the largest percentage of genderqueer/GNC, transgender, and “other” gender-identified members among all 52 sections of ASA.

Race:

- **Race demographics overview:** White: 351/506 (69.37%), Asian/Asian American: 47/506 (9.29%), Multiple selected: 35/506 (6.92%), African American: 28/506 (5.53%), Hispanic/Latin(o)a: 24/506 (4.74%), Missing: 13/506 (2.57%), Other identity: 8/506 (1.58%), Native American: 0/506 (0%).

Important Points:

- 33 sections (including Sex & Gender) have lower percentages of White members than Sexualities. 18 sections have higher percentages of White members than Sexualities.

- 14 sections have higher percentages of African American members than Sexualities; 37 sections (including Sex & Gender) have lower percentages of African American members than Sexualities.

- 29 sections (including Sex & Gender) have higher percentages of Asian/Asian American members than Sexualities; 22 sections have lower percentages of Asian/Asian American members than Sexualities.

- 27 sections (including Sex & Gender) have higher percentages of Hispanic/Latin(o)a members than Sexualities; 24 sections have lower percentages of Hispanic/Latin(o)a members than Sexualities.

- Only three sections have Native American members: Racial & Ethnic Minorities; Race, Gender, and Class; and Latina(o) Sociology.

Moving Forward:

- The section must explore strategies to welcome, recruit, and support BIPOC scholars.
Council Meeting

Copy and paste below (or attach separately) the agenda and draft/approved meeting minutes of all council meetings. Minutes must include a list of council members present and a summary of decisions made. Minutes are not a transcript of proceedings but a listing of what discussions took place and official actions taken.

ASA Section on the Sociology of Sexualities
2020 Council Meeting Agenda

August 4, 2020 from 9:00 am – 10:30 am (PST)/12:00 pm – 2:00 pm (EST)

PRESENT: Tey Meadow, Theo Greene, Angela Jones, Vrushali Patil, Carla Pfeffer, Tristan Bridges, Alithia Zamantakis, Tristen Kate, Michelle Gomez Parra, Minwoo Jung Brandon Andrew Robinson, Greggor Mattson, D’Lane Compton

10. Thank You to Outgoing Members and Welcome New Section Officers

TM welcomed everyone to the council meeting, noting specifically incoming and outgoing council members and officers. TM established rules for discussion, asking council members to unmute when they were ready to speak, or to write comments in the chat section for TG to read aloud to the group.

c. Outgoing Council Members (D’Lane R. Compton, Tristan Bridges), Student Representatives (Alithia Zamantakis, Tristen Kade), Past-Chair (Carla Pfeffer)

d. New Chair (Vrushali Patil), Chair-Elect (Angela Jones), Student Representatives (Michelle Gomez Parra, Minwoo Jung), and Council Members (Brandon Andrew Robinson, Greggor Mattson)

11. Financial/Membership Report (Theo Greene)

TG read financial report provided in advance to the council. See Appendix A for full report.

12. Committee Reports (Committee Chairs)

TM noted that council members requested to view the written reports from the Section Awards Committees. Noting their variability in detail, she will collate the materials and provide them to the council members for review. TM then called on each of the committee chairs to discuss the process for the awards.

• Graduate Student Paper Award (Ghassan Moussawi)

GhMo admitted to requesting the written reports, noting that understanding the processes are helpful and ensure transparency over how the awards were chosen. The
committee followed the previous rubric provided by KA and TB with a key change—adding interdisciplinarity to the criteria to incorporate interdisciplinary work and work that does not fall within mainstream sociology. The committee received 18 submissions and narrowed it down to five papers. The committee awarded the prize to Minwoo Jung, with an honorable mention (Nisarg Mehta). GM notes that the well-established rubric made the selection process very smooth.

- **Distinguished Article Award Committee (Shantel Gabriel Buggs)**

  SGB: The committee largely use the rubric from the previous year but made some additional changes. The papers were not evaluated until the spring. The committee received approximately 20 submissions. In consideration of the responsibilities committee members faced during the pandemic, the labor of reading the articles was divided with first and second readers. After two rounds of reading and deliberation, Theo Greene’s chapter was selected with two honorable mentions. It was tough decision, but the rubric was super helpful. Something to keep in mind was diversity, which was hard to enforce when you don’t know the author or their background. The committee recommends rethinking the process for collecting information about the author; however, the question of how to collect that data presents a challenge.

  GhMo echoed SGB’s comments related to diversity. People considered diversity based on institutional affiliation, but his committee wanted to think about what diverse scholarship is, which is why the committee included interdisciplinarity.

  TM noted that operationalizing diversity will be a key issue to discuss in the meeting after review of reports.

- **Best Book Award (Vrushali Patil)**

  VP noted that the committee drew on provided by AJ from last year’s committee and amended it to include the quality of writing. The committee received 11 submissions with 2 rounds of review: an initial round where people read all the books and compiled a shortlist, and a second round, after which, people came with their top selections. Although there was largely consensus over the selection of the co-winners (Elizabeth Bernstein and Nicola Mai), the one issue that VP struggled with was the level of commitment among committee members. Despite making a commitment to participate on the BBA committee, several people did not show up to meetings.

  KA added that there were five committee members, but both the zoom calls had three reviewers on each call, creating inconsistency in terms of who was on which call. Fortunately, the committee had a consensus in terms of the winners; however, without consensus, it would have been different.

  VP described the frustration of people signing up for a certain meeting time and then ghosting. It makes a big impact in terms of who does the labor. But the committee ended up with two winners, with really good choices.
TG recommended that we make the work commitments more transparent in order that people are clear on the expectations of serving these committees and can plan accordingly.

TM suggested that we should establish a working group to explore the distribution of labor to prevent a few people being saddled with the pressure of making decisions. The committee would be responsible for communicating expectations and having a removal process for those who do not pull their full weight.

- Martin Levine Dissertation Award

TM: The committee received 11 submissions this year and was impressed by the quality of work that graduate students were doing. Numerically, the committee used an updated version of last year’s rubric. Five proposals rose to the top that made deliberations challenging. The committee debated over whether to award co-winners, which would force the co-winners to split the cash award. However, the committee felt compelled to award Minwoo Jung and Jesse Holzman, whose projects were different methodologically, but their work was intersectional. The committee also gave an honorable mention to Jamie O’Quinn, which while exploring a less diverse community, offered a project that was under-researched in sexuality studies and could make a large impact. TM recommended that we consider what it means to award multiple people. If there are a lot of high-quality contributions, does it water down the power of the award to award three people?

TG reminded the council that we also have to consider the fact that we are spending down the balance of the endowment.

TM asked whether we should reach out to our senior colleagues for suggestions to keep the endowment going? We need to be proactive to ensure that we don’t run out of the funds.

- Program Committee (Tey Meadow)

TM: The program committee solicited suggestions for panels for ASA. We did not receive a lot. There was a process of deliberation. We went up with three: White Supremacy, Consolidating a couple of different panels (Intimate Labor; Sex), and the third one. We already had a panel in place on transnational sequence of panels. One of them were moving forward. Most people were not submitting online. Concerns about not knowing who was in the room. Section should consider how to do this if we have another online year. If next year is online, there are a lot of questions pertaining to how we should do this.

- Nominations Committee (Carla Pfeffer)

CP: Carla worked with B. Ethan Coston and Ghassan Moussawi. The committee had 5 different positions to fill: chair-elect, council, student representatives. They received 15 self-nominations and supplemented the list with 9 additional names to yield 4 times the necessary submission. The committee attempted to ensure that the list was representative of the membership while also ensuring the slates were not tokenizing underrepresented groups. The chair position was difficult to fill, given the complex responsibilities of the
position. There were very few self-nominations and few people willing to nominate others. The report includes a list of people who might make good candidates in the future but could not run this year due to conflicting commitments. The election process without a hitch; people did not feel overwhelmed by the three candidates per position. The results this year were not sent to the officers as in previous years, and as a result, the committee did not have the opportunity to thank those who were in the running but did not win. As ASA transitions, it is important for the committee to ensure that candidates are still contacted timely and thanked for their willingness to run for office.

AJ: Is ASA not sending notifications? Or are they not sending out the way that we would?

CP: They usually went to the leadership: the chair, past-chair, and secretary treasurer, but this year, it only went to the chair.

TM clarified that she was only alerted to the winner of the chair-elect position. She thought that the winners would be notified. And the people who didn’t win also received emails.

Both GrMa and MJ admitted to receiving a notification about their winning. MJ stated that the letter seemed rather generic.

TM assessed that there seemed to have been a system failure. The section announced the winners of the election because Sex and Gender announced theirs, but Sexualities did not automatically get the results. She had to specifically request them. TM will follow up with Mark Fernando to ensure that the process goes smoother in the future.

AJ suggested putting together a comprehensive document from chair to chair that someone on nominations will have to follow up with candidates who did not win. TM stated that we actually need a committee to review and organize the section documents that would make it easy to follow. Several documents existed but were difficult to locate, while others are out of date. There is an awards handbook that is totally out of date. The files should be streamlined.

TB typed that we might consider making notifications a part of all committees. “In my experience, some committees notify all people who’ve submitted and some don’t. Just to build on what Carla was saying. I’m not sure if that’s our practice, but I think it should be if it isn’t – for all committees.”

VP stated that she found the files we have in Tasks rather helpful. We could use that as the starting point. It would go a long way to address what we are talking about.

CP believed that council members might need access to the folders. It might only be the chairs, and secretary/treasurer. TG confirmed.

TM: There should be committee folders that the secretary/treasurer and chair would be able to access. And we need to ensure that the committees can have access to the Dropbox folders for committee work.
13. Early Career/Simon Gagnon Award Updates (Tey Meadow for CJ Pascoe)

S&G only had four nominations, but we had to solicit for more nominations. It is unclear whether the low numbers are an artifact of how people consider the process difficult, but it seems that this has been an ongoing problem. We have a lifetime achievement award that nobody is nominating for, which we should keep in mind. Of the four nominations, everybody was above the bar. The people were eminent; they didn’t want to publish the number of nominations in the award report because they did not want the other nominees to feel that they were being compared radically differently from Gloria Gonzalez Lopez, who did win. There are some big questions in terms in how high we want the bar for applications to be (which is the case across all career awards). How exactly do we want the evaluations to work?

There has been an extensive internal audit of the EC award process this year. What happened with the committee/selection process is symptomatic of larger systemic issues across the section, in terms of the architecture of the process (e.g. committees following previous rubrics, making subtle changes, but sometimes taking liberties in terms of terms of taking liberties in terms of eligibility, what the award is supposed to recognize, what the process will look like to committee (are there qualitative/quantitative evaluations; how do you evaluate work outside research). Does every candidate get discussed? How do the aggregate numbers configure into deliberation? How to consider diversity or type of institution? Is there too much latitude? And within the framework, there are a lot of biases that come into play. The committee composition also reflects the council composition. We are going to have questions about composition of the committee. And what happens if we think there could were biases in deliberation? There was enough evidence to indicate that some biases arising out of ambiguities over process that came into play during deliberations. While it did not change the outcome of the award, it is clear that substantial work must be done in terms of biases.

TM wants to convene a panel of council over the year to address a system overhaul of our awards process, in terms of clarifying the purpose of the award, the composition of the committee, and the decisions existing at their discretion. The process of evaluation should be standardized, but the decisions over rubrics should be made by the council. TM also suggests detailed, centralized recordkeeping. And do we want the council to approve selections before they are announced?

VP also envisions a committee for what should be done regarding the awards, and best practices. As part of that, thinking about actual awards we have right now. The panel might also consider how to honor to J. Erica Sumerau. What if we have a new mid-career award, where the issues that came up in this iteration could be used as criteria? That creates complexities and confusion. Have a mid-career award separate from the early career award and give the first award to J. Erica? The challenge is that ASA only allows sections to give up to five awards a year, which is why we have alternating awards. Are there other iterations possible? An alternating early career/mid-career? Another award to think about is an early and mid-career award alternating with S&G every three years? There are also other versions. Should we go back to alternating the book/article awards to make room for the mid-career award? We might want to rethink the awards.

SGB replies, while she understands the impulse to alternate other awards, going back to a system that alternates books/articles create new problems. Graduate students comprise much
of the membership and given that graduate students can submit papers for the article award, we
don’t want to cut opportunities to recognize graduate students. Additionally, going back to an
alternating system would likely double the workload for the committee. She doesn’t want to
take away opportunities from graduate students to be honored, while we have opportunities to
deal with people who are more advanced.

VP agrees with SGB. Whoever was on the committee will need to juggle multiple competing
interests.

GhMo notes that he understands that the committee composition reflects the composition of the
council. The committee had two people on council and four people outside the council.
However, the committee structure has one person of color and one transnational scholar. This
increases the emotional labor for scholars of color. What happens if we reversed that, having
five transnational scholar vs. one U.S. scholar? He expresses discomfort often being the only
person of color or the only transnational scholar on the committee. Where is equity? He
nominated a person with a 3-3 load and three books. He is concerned that people are not
considering seriously what is legible to other scholars.

TG agrees, adding that the committee should also think about how our biases reflect
scholars at research intensive institutions. It would also be great to honor great scholarship for
people in teaching intensive institutions, many of which may also have an overrepresentation of
African-descended scholars. He also mentioned that the section should standardize terms that
are thrown around as criteria for the awards: intersectionality (which many people use yet do
dnot completely understand), transnational scholarship, and even what constitutes work in
sexualities.

GhMo adds that the reason why he would like to see the written reports is to get a sense of the
process. We want to see who was nominated? Whose work (how the work) was intelligible?
These reports help provide transparency to understand what the section celebrates as
noteworthy work in sexualities. We should experiment with the awards committee composition
— where there are multiple people of color and one white person. He expressed happiness with
the award winners, highlighting how the committee has seen some great strides in moving
beyond the gatekeeper journals, particularly with the first chapter being honored for
Distinguished Article, and a woman of color winning the S&G.

Responding to GM, AJ said that, as someone on the SG awards committee, she supports the
council standardizing the award rubrics. What does it mean for EC and S&G? The consensus
was the person GM advanced was not at the lifetime stage in their career, despite the fact that
everyone was excited for the nomination. The committee felt that this person could easily get it
in five-to-seven years. However, the issue goes back to the central question of what it means to
earn the award.

GhMo notes that the “let’s wait” is often problematic, as it often disadvantages people of color.
White scholars win when their work is not even being published. He notes that, too often,
nominating someone from these career prizes is about gaming the system; when he submitted
his nomination, he had to make sure that he secured senior white scholars who work in the U.S.
to also sign the letter because transnational scholarship is often illegible.
AJ agrees, as one who is often represents only black person on every committee, what GhMo suggests in terms of composition is impossible. Given the composition of the section, we have few black people in the section. If we want to be transformative, we will need to think about how to recruit people of color and transnational scholars. It is difficult to overrepresent the committees with people of color at this point. And then to address our structural issues, we are going to ask people to do this labor all the time.

TM: There must be a committee with an expansive vision to think about these issues. Do we need to reproduce the same awards as other sections, which seems to reproduce inequality in terms of what the best it? Can we think of these awards differently, like a theoretical agenda setting award? We don’t have to do what other sections do, thus reproducing the same kind of value judgment that was in R-1. We could throw away all five awards. The diversity issue is a huge problem, which forces us to think about doing work that bridges across the sections, perhaps a Sexualities takeover by a different section to explore what kind of work is being done among those members and perhaps to recruit them into our section.

14. Discussion of Equity and Diversity within the Section (Angela Jones)

AJ: The committee began the Task Force in 2018 to review section leadership, awards, and membership. It was established to ensure that the section reflects and living up to its commitments to inclusion and transformative social justice. 2019 the primary focus of the committee was to ensure changes in the language for the awards and soliciting feedback from membership in terms of the nominations process. As a result, the 2019 elections reflected a far more racially diverse slate of candidates and award winners. We still need more data in terms of membership, leadership. The goal is to move beyond tokenistic inclusion in membership and leadership as well as making meaningful choices about the scholarship the section values which is critical in terms of pushing Sociology forward.

The chairs have disproportionately been white. Salvador Vidal Ortiz was the first POC elected chair (2013) and for three consecutive years, we had Latinx people assume the role of chair. In 2019, VP was the first South Asian elected chair, while in 2020 AJ is the first black person elected chair. There has only been two POC elected secretaries. The council and the graduate student representatives are a bit more diverse.

One of the issues that CP and AJ ran into concerned other demographic variables. We don’t want to make assumptions about people’s identity, nor was it readily available on the internet. With those challenges in mind, the representation of leadership was overwhelmingly cis, and there appears to be underrepresentation from teaching institutions and community colleges.

In terms of the awards, the dissertation fellowship is the only award committee that has given the award to a trans or nonbinary scholar, and we have never given an award to a transfeminine scholar. What is troubling is that our section has the highest representation of trans and nonbinary people than any section in ASA. While POC scholars have won awards (although it is problematic when we collapse different people in a singular category, which erases different groups), only three black people have ever received an award. The section should expand the diversity pools. There must be special emphasis on black, indigenous, and trans scholars (especially transfeminine scholars).
In terms of membership, our section has the highest percentage of genderqueer, gender nonconforming folks. We have no indigenous scholars in our section. There is more work we can do to extend to other sections beyond Sex and Gender.

CP: Thinking about strides, if we look at the Levine Dissertation Award, we are thinking about broadest ASA membership. It has gone roughly equally. 9 white people, 7 people of color, but it has never gone to a black scholar. 5 transnational scholars. More people in the mix would help. Thinking about who we partner with for section receptions, we have to be honest with why we make the choices we do, but we partner with Sex and Gender because of their size and budget. We may have to partner with multiple sections.

AJ: What do mean about being representative? Are we looking for representation of the section? Overrepresentation of marginalized groups? How do we set the bar on what is sufficient representation? We have been on many search committees, and HR would fail search that did not have diverse representation. We should consider scrapping awards searches if we don’t have the proper representation. Committees should do more work to solicit a diverse nominations pool.

TG: Committees could use the digest to recruit more nominations. We did that with S&G. We also have other outlets to advertise these awards (i.e. social media).

SB wrote, “I’m also wondering how these numbers look different since I’m pretty sure we had a bit of an “exodus” of members due to some issues in the section.”

SB: People’s different axes of identity are not known. Not everyone who identify as trans are out. With people of color, we can’t go off from their photo. How do we then determine sufficient enough representation?

TB wrote, “Small point: I also think our reception model privileges an intimidating social scene for many scholars in our section - particularly those anxious about connecting with people. Maybe we can come up with ideas that are more inclusive.”

Echoing what TB said, KA explains she has thought about our vision for the section. Thinking about this question, how do we encourage people to connect with the section? Who are submitting to these awards? How do we encourage people to nominate themselves or others for these awards? We might do direct targeting to get people who might be intimidated to submit to do so. What can we do now to ensure that we are heading where we need to be? It is important to make a clear commitment to what is our vision, and how we can each make sure that we are accountable to doing that work.

VP said that the most important things is to go out and recruit more diverse people into the section. 5% of the section is black, we need to change that. One of the most important things to think about is how do we go out and recruit members to make it more diverse. That will impact that diversity of committees, leadership, and awards.

GrMa: Regarding diversity, it would have been helpful to prompt nominators to consider how a person’s research helps contribute to the diversity of sexualities scholarship. We can’t know who
the first gen scholar is without a nominator indicating that. Perhaps putting a prompt in the soliciting awards to highlighting the intersectionality of the award.

AJ believes it is important to focus on diversifying nominations, and also expanding criteria for awards. To what extent are award committees taking representation into account when they get down to their shortlist? Is this something that we want committees to consider. Getting to GrMA’s point, many of the awards do not require nomination letters, so if we wanted to pursue this as a policy, we would need to re-institutionalize nomination letters for the awards. There is a skepticism for people to disclose this information.

SB adds that with a lot of self-nominations, it might be awkward for people to develop a laundry list of their various identities.

TM: One way is doing a demographic sheet. There is a stigma in terms of disclosing certain information about yourself (i.e. invisible disabilities). Without disclosing, nobody knows. There are a number of people who are struggle because invisible disabilities are not “cool” form of diversity to inhabit. With a demographic form, a person can check a box without necessarily having to write about it in a cover letter. Taking notes, there isn’t a structural feature of the operation of the section that is not in need of overhaul, from recruitment processes to awards. We have had a mass exodus of people because of these issues, which has further exacerbated the problems and these numbers and what we talk about. This is extended into the question of AMC sessions, and the kind of work that is celebrated is white and American focused. There is not much that requires a radical revision. It is important to think about what our section looks like in ten years without relying on assimilating with other committees. We need to think about recruitment of candidates for awards, making connections across sections, issues of in-group factor that result in the exodus of people at the graduate students who could be productive members if we didn’t seem so clique-y. We need some concrete next steps.

GhMo: Issues that TM is raising must be raised by the new committee. Two points: echoing KA, we should all have the same goals in common. We are all biased. AJ’s point in terms of equity that TG was trying to raise. One consideration in the nominations committee was to solicit people from totally different institutions. If you look at the slate, we have people from teaching institutions. Whoever assesses other people’s scholarship, we should also keep in mind that the top journals are also super exclusionary. Publishing in the top journals should not guarantee someone an award. And how do we assess work by people who occupy majority identities but work on minority communities.

TB wrote that we should also have a committee for supporting people who nominate.

AJ: Action Item – suggest that we institutionalize this task force. This will never finish. The committee should get to work with concrete actionable items in the fall. In the fall, we can have better direction for recruitment and awards. Let’s use the momentum.

TM: What if we convene an emergency task force for the fall. It could be comprised for people of all of this. We need to respond to the immediate, but we also need to think about a longer, more sustained process. We should not make structural changes very quickly. We should have a standing oversight committee ensuring equity moving forward that we cycle from year to year.
We need something addressing the immediate and then moving forward to something long term. Council seems agreeable.

**SB:** Clarification between the two different committees.

**TM:** Work with the flawed system now, but we can put some things in place quickly that mitigates harm, followed by systemic issues.

AJ volunteers. The composition of that committee should be folks who have been around for a while. This committee would benefit for being involved with the section with institutional memory. That was an issue with the EC award. We also think we need another committee to organizing the archive? Whoever is on the award call needs to be connected with the other committee.

**TM:** Alternative suggestion. We have two committees to populate. The organizational thing will not happen in time to benefit the awards process.

**AJ:** Who is on that committee has access in full to all the documents.

i. Angela as chair of the committee.
ii. CP: Carla will serve as a volunteer for that committee if people are interested.
iii. Mitigating Harm/Figuring out the stopgap measures are Shantel, Tristan, Ghassan, and Michelle.
iv. TG states that it might make sense to have continuity. TG also volunteered to serve on the committee ex officio to help with locating documents and ensuring access.
v. Labors (“grunt-work”): Tey, Minwoo, Kate
vi. Documents: Theo, Greggor

15. ASA Book Forum Task Force (Tey Meadow)

- See Appendix Two. Do we express our concerns to the ASA board about the absence of sexualities scholarship recognized on these panels?
- There is a bigger and much greater systemic issues.

**BR:** The problem was several-fold. The approach was not useful – to write as many proposals as possible. That is not a useful approach moving forward. Two better approaches: one getting sexualities people into higher ASA power position, and another is finding an advocate on the committee, as a section, we are going to honor this transnational work. It’s a social capital game. They nominated 11 or 12 books, and they were transnational, trans, and people of color. Tey’s book was selected, likely because of the book award.

**CP:** Is it useful to partner with the section on transnational scholarship. There are half-ass overtures of leadership.

**VP:** There is a reason why we gravitate more toward sex and gender than other places. There is less interest in sexualities scholarship and issues that we are discussing. The chair is much more open about a lot of these issues, to discuss these suggestions.
CP: Part of the request for a joint reception, could come to all the leadership of these two sections, that would be another way to move forward.

VP: The chair would be interested in thinking about the exclusions, as well as the issues of race and intersectionality.

Council meeting was adjourned at 2:05 pm.
Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by TG.

APPENDIX ONE: REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY/TREASURER

MEMBERSHIP:

Our current membership totals 412, down from 454 in 2019. The slight decline is likely attributed to the cancellation of ASA 2020, where we often find people renewing when they register for the conference. The numbers have steadily increased over the course of the year, however, due to a push by the Secretary/Treasurer to encourage memberships renewals and gift memberships through the biweekly digest.

Although we do want to encourage people to renew their memberships by September 30 (to keep our plans for a journal alive), the session allotment for ASA 2021 will be determined based on our numbers in 2019 (unless we exceed our membership numbers in 2020).

Our scheduled “day” for ASA’s 2021 Annual Meeting is Tuesday, August 10.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION:

NB: These estimates are based on the latest financial information provided by ASA (ending in June 2020). This report may change between now and the Business Meeting on August 10.

As of August 02, our section has a balance of $2,672.00. This balance reflects $1600 donation to ASA’s Minority fellowship program but does not reflect expenses for award plaques and shipping ($455.65), nor the $1,000 still earmarked for Alithia zamantakis to complete the preconference report from 2018.

The additional expenses for this year’s awards are due to the increase of awards given over 2019 plus the additional expenses of shipping award plaques to the winners due to the cancellation of ASA’s Annual Meeting.

Given those pending expenses, I project that our section will have an estimated surplus of $1,216 following the virtual conference.

APPENDIX TWO: EMAIL FROM AMC TASK FORCE

PLEASE REVIEW THE FOLLOWING EMAIL RELATED TO THE ASA BOOK SALONS.

Awards
Provide a list of section awards and awardees conferred in the past year.
**Sociology of Sexualities 2020 Distinguished Book Award**

CO-WINNERS:

**Sociology of Sexualities 2020 Distinguished Article Award**


HONORABLE MENTIONS:

**The 2020 Sociology of Sexualities Martin P. Levine Memorial Dissertation Fellowship**

CO-WINNERS:
Jesse Holzman (University of Illinois, Chicago) “Serving LGBTQ Youth Experiencing Homelessness”
Minwoo Jung (University of Southern California) “Queer Geopolitics: LGBTQ Projects in the Global Political Economy”

HONORABLE MENTION:
Jamie O’Quinn (University of Texas at Austin) “Married as Minors: Young Women’s Experiences with U.S. ‘Child Marriages’”

**2020 Best Graduate Student Paper in the Sociology of Sexualities Award**

Winner: "Quiet Politics: Queer Organizing in Corporate Singapore" by Minwoo Jung (University of Southern California)
Honorable Mention: “In search of a ‘gay atmosphere’: emplacing sexual boundary-work” by Nisrag Mehta (University of Chicago)

**Sociology of Sexualities Early Career Award CO-WINNERS:**
Brandon Andrew Robinson, University of California, Riverside -and- Sarah Diefendorf, Scholars Strategy Network

**Simon-Gagnon Lifetime Achievement Award**

Dr. Gloria Gonzalez-Lopez, The University of Texas at Austin

*The Simon-Gagnon Lifetime Achievement Award is announced at ASA in even numbered years but officially awarded at ASA during odd numbered years in order to organize a session around the recipient’s work during the odd numbered year. Dr. Lopez was selected as the 2021...*
Simon-Gagnon Lifetime Achievement Award last year. She will officially receive the award at the 2021 Sexualities Business Meeting in Chicago.

2020 Finances
Provide a narrative on how the 2020 budget matched with actual expenses and income from 2020. Please account for any substantive differences.

As of August 02, our section has a balance of $2,672.00. This balance reflects $1600 donation to ASA’s Minority fellowship program but does not reflect expenses for award plaques and shipping ($455.65), nor the $1,000 still earmarked for alithia zamantakis to complete the preconference report from 2018.

The additional expenses for this year’s awards are due to the increase of awards given over 2019 plus the additional expenses of shipping award plaques to the winners due to the cancellation of ASA’s Annual Meeting.

Given those pending expenses, I project that our section will have an estimated surplus of $1,216 following the virtual conference.

The pandemic and the subsequent cancelation of a physical ASA Meeting resulted in several deviations from our budget in 2020. The Section voted to donate the money earmarked for the reception to the ASA Minority Fellowship program as a demonstration of solidarity with the BLM Protests last summer (this practice fell in line with several sections who made similar donations). The cancelation of a physical conference resulted in shipping award plaques to the winners, which included duties charges for shipping one award to an international address. To cover these costs, we diverted monies earmarked for our Mentorship Program, which we had to cancel due to the virtual meeting. Finally, the costs of the award plaques exceeded our proposed budget due to additional award winners in several categories – funds which we covered by drawing from the money budgeted for the Mentorship Program.