

associated with a natural person, then it stay with that person throughout, and cannot be transferred, which also means that the voting rights stay with that person permanently. You join the Society to participate in its affairs, and support its goals, and that support isn't something you can freely resell.

However, the right to attend the annual meeting of the Society is something that can be freely transferred. If a person buys an attending supplement, that supplement can be transferred to anyone who is already a member of the Society (which means someone who has a supporting membership already). So the large investment in attending the meeting is one that a person can make, but it's not irrevocable—that supplement can be sold to anyone who wants it.

This also doesn't prevent the Worldcon from selling "admissions", which allow people to attend the meeting, without being members of the Society. And those admissions therefore don't require a supporting membership, and don't carry any voting rights for Hugos or site selection (since those are associated with membership in the Society, not with the admission to the meeting). This also follows the practices of other professional societies, many of which allow non-members to attend their annual meetings, although often at a higher price.

We do continue the practice of allowing things like clubs to buy a supporting membership, just for purposes of supporting the Society. However, the Constitution already restricts the voting rights of entities other than natural persons ( see Sections 4.3 and 6.2 of the Constitution). And, in the case of death of a member of the Society, which would automatically transfer the membership via the estate, we do permit that transfer.

Administratively, it also makes life much easier for Hugo and site selection administrators. They will no longer need to keep track, through a chain of transfers, which voting rights have been exercised (and different committees have had different rules for how those cases are to be handled, since the Constitution doesn't explicitly cover those cases, except with the general rule that you only get to vote once). The proposers of this motion have been administrators for both of those votes, in the past, and find that making administrators lives easier, without impairing the rights of the members to vote, is very much a feature.

But, while administrative ease is really a nice benefit, the philosophical underlying basis is the primary reason for this motion—it makes it clear that joining the Society is a decision that each person makes, and they continue to hold that position, and its accompanying rights, until they terminate due to the end of the convention. People can decide to attend the meeting, or not—and that can be transferred—but joining the Society is a philosophical decision that a person makes once for each Worldcon, and is held on to.

### **B.2.11 Short Title: Young Adult Award**

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution for the purpose of establishing an award for Young Adult literature by ~~striking out~~ and [adding](#) words as follows:

1. Insert words in existing sections 3.7.3 and 3.10.2 as follows:

**3.7.3:** Nominations shall be solicited only for the Hugo Awards, ~~and~~ the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer, and the <blank> Award for Best Young Adult Book.

**3.10.2:** Final Award ballots shall list only the Hugo Awards, ~~and~~ the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer, and the <blank> Award for Best Young Adult Book.

2. Insert the following section before existing Section 3.4.:

**3.X: <blank> Award for Best Young Adult Book.** The <blank> Award for Best Young Adult Book is given for a book published for young adult readers in the field of science fiction or fantasy appearing for the first time during the previous calendar year, with such exceptions as are listed in Section 3.4.

*Provided that filling the < blank> in this amendment to name the award shall not be considered a greater change in the scope of the amendment.*

*Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2021 Business Meeting, Section 3.X shall be repealed and the modifications to 3.7.3 and 3.10.2 reversed; and*

*Provided further that the question of re-ratification shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2021 Business Meeting.*

**Proposed by:** Members of the YA Award Committee

**Commentary:** The YA award Committee is proposing a new WSFS award for Young Adult fiction that, like the Campbell Award, would not be a Hugo but would be administered by the WSFS. There have been many attempts going back to the 1990s to create a YA Hugo award, but none of these were successful. The previous year's YA Hugo Committee (2014-2015) determined that a Hugo was not feasible, while this year's Committee determined that an award in the mold of the Campbell has merits.

For details of the Committee's findings, please see the Report submitted to the Business Meeting. In brief, no sponsor is required for an award, which would be a WSFS-sponsored award. Like the Hugo and Campbell, it would be added to the Constitution. The award would be paid for and administered by each Worldcon and presented during the Hugo Ceremony.

This proposal represents the closest we could come to a consensus in the time allotted. Although there are areas where the members of the Committee do not perfectly agree, we feel this proposal reflects our general feeling that a YA award at Worldcon is viable. We recommend its passage and the creation of a separate committee to move forward with consideration of a name for this new award and the physical template for it.

### *Why No Definition of YA?*

Creating a Campbell-like award decreases the need for a strict definition of YA.

As demonstrated by the 2015 YA Hugo Committee Report, attempts to define YA produce extremely varied results, with attempts emphasizing intended audience, publishing categories and merchandizing, age of the protagonist, or elements internal to the narrative. A number of awards have chosen not to provide a definition.

Given the concern that we not recognize the same work as a finalist in more than one Hugo category, a Hugo category for YA would require that a constitutional amendment either distinguish YA from the existing fiction categories, or force authors/Hugo administrators to choose which of the two categories was most appropriate. With a Campbell-like award, the administrative need for an explicit definition is no longer necessary.

Finally, it is often argued that constitutional provisions function best when they leave room for the discretion of individual Worldcons, as well as changing times and interpretations. After deliberation, the committee concluded that it is preferable to keep references to teen/YA literature as general as possible.

### *Why “book” rather than “novel”?*

According to industry observers, teen lit/YA is one of the most flexible categories with respect to word count, encompassing an extremely wide range. This variety is a strong argument for not using strict word count criteria. Because teen/YA lit is such a flexible category, an award should reflect that reality.

We also discussed “book” as a broader term that could encompass the variety of excellent works that voters might choose to recognize. The term “book” allows voters to nominate beyond otherwise limiting descriptors such as “prose,” “print,” and so on.

### *Dual Eligibility*

As with the Campbell Award, a book nominated for a YA Award could also be nominated for a Hugo Award or Campbell Award, as these awards each have different criteria. As already established under the current rules, finalists have the opportunity to decline their nomination before the list is published.

### *Why the <blank> Award?*

It became clear that this naming issue is beyond the scope of this year’s committee, and should be a separate matter if an award is passed. We therefore left the name <blank> in this vote’s proposal, with the provision that filling in the blank would not be considered a greater change and could be done as part of the ratification process.

The appearance of the proposed award cannot be established until the name of the award is approved. It seems best that the costs and time needed to solicit a design be postponed until the award is (potentially) passed and ratified.

## C.3 Special Committees

### C.3.1 Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee

The Long List Committee has continued to curate the Long List of Worldcons and Long List of Worldcons. We are grateful to a number of people, including Janice Gelb, Chip Hitchcock, and René Walling for spotting a variety of minor errors, which we have now corrected.

The Long List Committee for 2015-2016 consists of Mark Olson (Chair), Craig Miller, David G. Grubbs, Joe Siclari, Kent Bloom, Colin Harris, Kevin Standlee, Tim Illingworth, and Ben Yalow.

The committee requests that the WSFS BM continue its endorsement of the committee for another year.

The current working website is at <http://www.smofinfo.com/LL/TheLongList.html>.

### C.3.2 YA Hugo Award Study Committee

**Committee Members:** Anna Blumstein, Adam Beaton, Jacquelyn Bowin, Warren Buff, Johnny Carruthers, Chris Garcia, Helen Gbala, Joshua Kronengold, Laura Lamont, Farah Mendelsohn, Adam Tesh, Tim Illingworth, Sue "Twilight" Mohn, David Peterson, Jodie Baker, Tehani Wessely, Dina Krause, Kate Secor, Marguerite Smith, Kevin Standlee, Lew Wolkoff, Peter De Weerd, Clark B. Wierda, Martin Easterbrook, Christine Rake (Co-Chair), Katie Rask (Chair)

This Committee was formed at Sasquan in 2015, following the report and motion by the 2015 YA Hugo Committee. That committee determined that under the existing methodology of the Hugo Awards, a separate category for YA fiction was not practical (the Hugo fiction categories being defined by word count, not by age categories). The Committee suggested instead the creation of a Campbell-like Award and requested the (re)formation of a Committee to focus specifically on the issues surrounding the creation of a Campbell-like YA/teen lit award, with the results presented at next year's Business Meeting.

The 2015/2016 Committee therefore focused specifically on the issues surrounding the creation of a Campbell-like YA/teen lit award.

**Findings:** The Committee investigated the features of the Campbell and the Hugo, considered once more definitions of YA/teen lit, studied the costs and logistics of award creation, debated naming conventions, and addressed features most suitable in a proposal for such an award. Details of some of this work can be found in the Exhibits to this report, entitled 'The Hugo vs. The Campbell,' 'Young Adult Award Considerations,' and 'Naming an Award and Designing a Trophy/Plaque.'

1. The Committee finds that a Campbell-like award is feasible under the WSFS Constitution. Currently, the text-based literature awards presented by the Worldcon Membership follow two organizational methods, awarded to: 1) *work* (categorized by *length*, the Hugos), and 2) *author* (categorized by *time*

- in the field*, the Campbell). A YA Award would offer a third variation, presented to *work* (organized by *age group*).
2. No sponsor is required if WSFS rule establishes such an award. It would be a WSFS-sponsored award and the rules would be set by a vote of WSFS at the Business Meeting (and thus added to the Constitution).
  3. The Committee worked on drafting a proposal built on its findings. In an ideal situation, proposals for constitutional amendments are released early in order to get feedback. In our case, the Committee's main purpose (the investigation/report of a Campbell-like award) proved time consuming, but we felt it was better to properly consider all aspects of the award's creation to do justice to it. That being said, we have drafted a constitutional amendment proposal reflecting our most recent discussions and compromises. We welcome the input of fellow WSFS members. The amendment proposal discussion is presented under [Item B.2.11 Young Adult Award](#).
  4. We believe that the Committee should be (re)formed with the purpose of considering potential names for the award. We therefore left the name <blank> in the amendment proposal, with the provision that filling in the <blank> would not be considered a greater change and could be done as part of the ratification process.

**Motion:** The Committee requests that the Business Meeting reform the Committee for another year (with the addition of new members). The new version of the Committee will (1) solicit and evaluate name ideas and thoroughly research all the options and/or (2) develop and refine a proposal based on the discussion at this year's Business Meeting as well as additional public input.

## EXHIBIT 1: THE HUGO VS. THE CAMPBELL

### The Campbell and WSFS

In 1973, the Campbell Award was created to honor John W. Campbell (1910-1971), the editor of the *Analog Science Fiction and Fact* magazine for over 30 years. The Campbell wasn't a WSFS Award, but from the beginning it was presented at Worldcon. It was allowed on the Hugo Award ballot as an exception and is mentioned briefly in the WSFS Constitution.

Prior to 1980, individual Worldcons were allowed to include additional non-Hugo awards on the ballot (such as the short-lived Gandalf award). The Noreascon II Business Meeting in 1980 amended the Constitution to prohibit any award from the ballot except the thereafter constitutionally approved Hugo and the Campbell.

For a non-Hugo award to be permitted on the Hugo ballot, it must be approved by the Business Meeting and amended to the Constitution. Such an award does not need to follow the Hugo methodology to qualify.

## **Administration of the Awards**

### *Features of the Hugo Best Novel:*

- Rules for awarding the Hugo determined by Members of WSFS
- Ballot administered by the current Worldcon and Hugo Administration Committee
- Selection and nomination: previous, current, and following Worldcon members nominate; only current members vote
- Each Worldcon funds the trophy creation and base design, and designates someone to present the award
- All nominees receive a pin and the winner receives a Hugo trophy with base
- Awarded for a science fiction or fantasy story of forty thousand (40,000) words or more
- ‘Dual Eligibility’ not allowed in the literature categories; a work cannot be nominated for more than one literature Hugo, due to the word count divisions

### *Features of the John W. Campbell Award for Best Writer:*

- Sponsored by the publisher of *Analog*, currently Dell Magazine (i.e., not a WSFS Award)
- Rules for awarding the Campbell determined by the award sponsor
- Ballot administered by the current Worldcon and Hugo Administration Committee, in the same manner as the Hugo
- Selection and nomination: previous, current, and following Worldcon members nominate; only current members vote
- Sponsor funds the award plaque and designates someone to present the award
- All nominees receive a pin and the winner receives a plaque
- Awarded to an author, a new SF writer whose first work was published in a professional publication in the previous two years
- “Dual eligibility” allowed; an author can be nominated for the Campbell and their work can be nominated for a Hugo

### *Main Differences Between the Awards*

The main features highlighted by the above comparison are:

- Sponsorship and Funding
- Ballot Administration and Award Presentation
- Selection and Nomination Process
- Recipient and Category

- Dual Eligibility
- Award Trophy/Plaque and Nominee Pin

With respect to a YA Award, these issues are addressed further in Exhibit 2.

## **EXHIBIT 2: YOUNG ADULT AWARD CONSIDERATIONS (BASED ON EXHIBIT 1)**

### *Sponsorship and Funding*

The Campbell Award continues to have a non-WSFS sponsor due to the historical features of its creation in 1973. Consultation with members of the Hugo Committees has indicated that no sponsor would be required if the award was established by WSFS rule. It would be a WSFS-sponsored award and the rules would be set by a vote of WSFS at the BM (and thus added to the Constitution). A WSFS-sponsored award would be paid for by Worldcons.

### *Ballot Administration and Award Presentation*

As a WSFS-sponsored award, administration of the ballot and presentation of the award would be managed by each year's Worldcon and the Hugo Award committee members.

### *Selection and Nomination Process*

As a WSFS-sponsored award, nominations would be determined by the previous, current, and following year's Worldcon members. The current Worldcon members would vote on the final ballot.

### *Recipient and Category*

Currently, the text-based literature awards presented by the Worldcon Membership follow two organizational methods, awarded to: 1) work (categorized by length, the Hugos), and 2) author (categorized by time in the field, the Campbell). A YA Award would offer a third variation, presented to work (organized by age group).

### *YA/Teen Lit Definitions*

Creating a Campbell-like award decreases the need for a strict definition of YA. As demonstrated by the 2015 YA Hugo Committee Report, attempts to define YA/teen lit produce extremely varied results, emphasizing intended audience, publishing categories and merchandizing, age of the protagonist, or elements internal to the narrative. A number of awards have chosen not to provide a definition.

Given the concern that we not recognize the same work as a finalist in more than one Hugo category, a Hugo category for YA would require that a constitutional amendment either distinguish YA from the existing fiction categories, or force authors/Hugo administrators to choose which of the two categories was most appropriate. With a Campbell-like award, the administrative need for an explicit definition is no longer necessary.

Finally, it is often argued that constitutional provisions function best when they leave room for the discretion of individual Worldcons, as well as changing times and interpretations. After deliberation, the committee concluded that it is preferable to keep references to teen/YA literature as general as possible.

#### *Word Count*

Although a minority argued for word limits to the award, the majority consensus was that a word count criteria was not necessary for a non-Hugo award. The original Hugo awards did not feature a defined word count, although word count divisions became criteria of the Hugo fiction literature categories following codification in the 1960s. Although those codifications were related to publishing norms at the time, the recent trends in industry, especially with respect to teen/YA literature, do not coincide with those earlier categories

According to industry observers, teen lit/YA is one of the most flexible categories with respect to word count, encompassing an extremely wide range. (As word count examples: *The Giver* 43,617, *Froi of the Exiles* 163,701, and *Deathly Hallows* 198,227.) This variety is a strong argument for not using strict word count criteria. Because teen/YA lit is such a flexible category, an effective award should reflect that reality.

#### *Dual Eligibility*

As with the Campbell Award, a book nominated for a YA Award could also be nominated for a Hugo Award or Campbell Award, as these awards each have different criteria. As already established under the current rules, finalists have the opportunity to decline their nomination before the list is published.

#### *Award Trophy/Plaque and Nominee Pin*

The design and physical manifestation of the award itself is dependent on the designated name of the award. See Exhibit 3.

### **EXHIBIT 3: NAMING AN AWARD AND DESIGNING A TROPHY/PLAQUE**

#### *Naming an Award*

If an award proposal should pass the Business Meeting, the next step would be to establish a name for the award. The Committee spent quite a bit of time debating this issue over the course of the past year. We determined that it needed greater study, preferably by the (re)formation of a Committee.

The naming of the award ultimately proved to be an incredibly complicated matter. While many YA awards have been named after people, others bear names referencing things or ideas. Regardless of which direction we took, the Committee found itself grappling with legal consequences, copyright matters, social ramifications, and the wide-ranging experiences of young readers. Moreover, we felt that it was important to be aware that some authors/symbols might bias nominators towards specific genres.

Although we discussed naming the award after certain influential authors, the Committee was inclined towards a thing, symbol, or other idea that was especially evocative. We hoped to capture the transformative, transportational, and captivating power of books for young people. It became clear that this complex and delicate matter was beyond the scope of this year's committee, and should be a separate matter if an award is passed.

We propose, therefore, the creation of a separate committee, should this year's award proposal pass, to solicit and evaluate name ideas and thoroughly research all the options. We therefore left the name blank in this vote's proposal, with the provision that filling in the blank would not be considered a greater change and could be done as part of the ratification process.

#### *Award Appearance*

The Committee briefly addressed the issue of an award appearance, researching the logistics and financial issues surrounding the creation of a trophy, statuette, or plaque (not all included here). The costs associated with the award itself include the trophy/plaque and engraving (with lapel pin and ribbons). As mentioned in Exhibit 1, the Campbell Award plaque is funded by the publisher of *Analog*, while each year's Worldcon covers the Hugo rockets. Hugo trophies usually cost in the neighborhood of \$200-400 for the rocket and its base. A plaque costs around \$60-80. The initial design of the award and its selection must also be taken into account.

The appearance of the proposed award cannot be established until the name of the award is approved. It seems best that the costs and time needed to solicit a design be postponed until the award is (potentially) passed and ratified.