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Upcoming State/Region Events/Activities:
Illinois State Festival - Dates TBA, Location: tentatively Palatine, IL
Indiana State Festival - March 27-29, 2009, Muncie Civic Theatre, Muncie, IN
  Adjudicators: Jack Phillips and Jim Carver
Michigan State Festival - no information yet
Ohio State Festival - no information yet
Wisconsin State Festival - February 28-March 1, 2009, Sauk Prairie Theatre Guild at
  The River Arts Center, Prairie Du Sac, WI
Region III AACT Festival - April 17-19, 2009, South Bend Civic Theatre, South Bend, IN
  Adjudicators: Annette Procunier, Ron Cameron-Lewis, Ron Ziegler

Past/Future Work Report:
A conference call meeting of the Region III state representatives was held on June 1, 2008. A quorum was reached and minutes were taken by Frank Peot of Wisconsin. Those minutes will soon be available on-line at a new Region III website being built by Bob Kafka. Among items discussed were the confirmation of the Region III Festival details, state reports and voting on the proposed "test" rule changes being discussed at the national level. Our next meeting was set to take place during the Region III Festival in South Bend at which time we would discuss the success or failure of the rule change as well as adding a new rule to our by-laws allowing for web/email-based meetings and votes.

Also, I have consulted with the Indiana state board to implement a Indiana Director's Conference to mirror the Madison conference on a state-wide level. The conference will take place in October at Indianapolis Civic Theatre. Indiana is also working on co-sponsoring a state-wide High School Theatre Festival for fall of 2009.

Interest Items:
It was voted by the Region III Board to 1) adopt the new lower threshold of 4 entries per state to qualify for the ability to send two entries on to the Regional Festival and 2) not to adopt the proposed panel adjudication format, but maintain the traditional individual and separate adjudication format. It was unanimously felt that the lower threshold would provide greater incentive for groups to participate and would provide a bigger event for the host company. It was also unanimously felt that the panel adjudication would lead to unavoidable influence from one adjudicator to another and remove the opportunity for groups to have a clear basis for comparison among adjudicator opinions and suggestions.