

IASPM 2015 GENERAL MEETING
Universidade Estadual de Campinas
2 July 2015

Minutes: Sue Miller (SM)

Present:

Outgoing Executive Committee: Goffredo Plastino (GP), Martha Ulhoa (MU), Sue Miller (SM), Alejandro Madrid (AM), Laura Jordán (LJ).

Franco Fabbri (FF): GM chair.

Rafael Dos Santos (RdS): chair of the conference Organizing Committee, Unviversidade Estadual de Campinas.

Hillegonda Rietfeld (HR): IASPM Journal editor in chief.

Koos Zwaan (KZ) and Berenice Corti (BC): auditors.

Silvia Martínez (SiM) and Samantha Bennett (SB): electoral officers.

Agenda

1. Call to order

Election of the Meeting Chair

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of the 2013 General Meeting minutes

Election of Auditors

Election of Electoral Officers

2. Executive Committee Report 2013-2015

3. IASPM Journal Report

4. IASPM 2015 Conference Report

5. IASPM Chairs Meeting Report

6. IASPM Branches Lists

7. Conference Proceedings

8. IASPM Book Prize

9. Election of the 2015-2017 Executive Committee

10. Next International Conference

11. AOB

Minutes

1. Call to order

Election of the Meeting Chair

GP officially opened the 2015 General Meeting at 09:19, invited Franco Fabbri to act as chair and asked if there were any objections. There were no objections from the floor.

Approval of the Agenda

FF addressed the first point in the agenda, the approval of the agenda, and then read out all the items on the agenda including the approval of the 2013 General Meeting minutes, the election of Auditors and the election of Electoral Officers, and items 2 to 11 of the agenda. MU proposed the approval of the agenda and FF asked for a second person to approve: KZ approved it. FF asked for a show of hands in favour and against and the agenda was approved.

Approval of the 2013 General Meeting minutes

FF then asked for the approval of the 2013 GM minutes, which were available on the IASPM website [http://www.iaspm.net/archive/Gijon_IASPM_GM_Minutes.pdf]. He asked if there were any amendments, suggestions or objections.

GP proposed a couple of amendments and one minor change. The first amendment regarded point 7, about the election of the 2013-15 executive committee, paragraph 4. It was written that Jan Hemming invited Franco Fabbri to say something about GP as one of his nominators. This is incorrect, as Franco was not one of GP nominators and "as one of his nominators" needed to be deleted from the minutes. Also the same paragraph stated that GP served as an executive member of the Italian branch; again, this was not accurate as he was not serving as a member of the Italian branch at the time. GP proposed to delete from the minutes "also serving as a member of the executive committee of the Italian branch".

GP also proposed a minor change in point 8 paragraph 2: "local branch representatives need to be consulted to discuss nomination to the executive committee". This point was about conference, not EC nomination, so he proposed a small change that is: "local branch representatives need to be consulted to discuss *conference* nomination to the executive committee."

FF asked if there were any objections to these changes; there were no objections: the changes and the minutes were approved by first and second votes.

Election of Auditors

FF moved to the election of auditors, who were already nominated by the outgoing EC, as they had to oversee the accounts. GF said that, as no nominations were received, the EC discussed the issue and identified via LJ two auditors to go through the accounts with LJ, before the GM.

KZ confirmed that he had seen all the accounts and invoices sent to him by LJ.

FF called for a vote to approve the Auditors: Koos Zwaan (KZ) and Berenice Corti (BC) and they were approved as auditors by the floor (first and seconded).

Election of Electoral Officers

FF moved to the election of electoral officers, which are nominated during the GM to evaluate the voting procedures (counting votes and checking for proxy votes). He asked if anyone was willing to be officers in this assembly. Silvia Martínez (SiM) and Samantha Bennett (SB) volunteered and were approved as Electoral Officers. FF asked the electoral officers to then check for members attending who have proxy votes: SB asked if any of those present had proxy votes and none had them.

Apologies

FF asked if there were apologies. GF said that apologies were received from two members of the outgoing EC: Ed Montano (EM) and Sara Jansson.

2. Executive Committee Report 2013-2015

GF said that the link to the EC report [available at http://www.iaspm.net/archive/2013-2015_IASPM_EC_Report.pdf] had been posted to the international list on June 16, and that the EC was also going to also read it out, as some would not have had a chance to read it. Some issues arising from the report were discussed in other meetings at the conference, and would have been discussed during the GM.

GF read the Chair report [available at http://www.iaspm.net/archive/2013-2015_IASPM_EC_Report.pdf]. In addition to it, GP mentioned that the IASPM Chair meeting discussed the access to the branches' lists, and that a proposal was going to be discussed later during the GM. About proceedings, GP also added to what already written in the Chair report that IASPM should have considered the need to publish conference proceedings, and for what kind of scholarly purposes; indeed, the GM in Campinas should have been an opportunity for a collective deliberation on the matter. If proceedings are still considered a valuable conference outcome, GP said that their editorship and publication should be the responsibility of the local Organizing Committee, and that given members of the EC should be involved in the process only as advisors.

FF asked for any comments on the Chair report, and none were expressed. The report was approved by the floor.

AM read the Membership Secretary report [available at http://www.iaspm.net/archive/2013-2015_IASPM_EC_Report.pdf].

FF asked for any comments on the report.

KZ asked about what happened to the money for non accepted grants. LJ replied that the money wasn't spent and was still in the IASPM bank account.

FF asked for the approval of Membership Secretary report. The report was approved by the floor, with one vote against.

LJ read the Treasurer / Membership Secretary report [available at http://www.iaspm.net/archive/2013-2015_IASPM_EC_Report.pdf].

FF asked for comments and approval of the accounts.

KZ said that he approved the accounts.

Jan Hemming (JH) asked if it is usual for the Organising Committee to cover the conference costs of the EC members, as he had presumed those costs came out of IASPM funds. LJ stated that usually

this is the case, with IASPM funds covering EC members' flights, but in this case and for the Gijón conference the OC managed to reimburse the EC costs. JH observed: if IASPM has 50,000 dollars available, then shouldn't they cover the costs? GP said that it is possible to apply for different funds to cover specific costs: each OC applies for different pots of funding, some of which are successful, partially successful or unsuccessful, and that every country has different funding avenues.

FF asked for the approval of the Treasurer / Membership Secretary report. The report was approved by the floor.

SM read the Web / Publications report [available at http://www.iaspm.net/archive/2013-2015_IASPM_EC_Report.pdf], in EM absence.

FF asked for the approval of the Web / Publications report. The report was approved by the floor.

3. IASPM Journal Report

HR reported on the Journal editorial meeting held the day before, 1 July 2015 [the minutes are available at http://www.iaspm.net/archive/IASPM_Journal_Minutes_2015-07-01.pdf].

FF asked for any comments.

A member asked about how readership numbers were tracked and if there was any data on IASPM journal readership. HR replied that all articles are registered with a DOI number and IASPM Journal does get a click tracking report from that, but that she is not sure how accurate such representation is. She will look into it and as soon as a new webmaster is appointed she will be able to give a report on this.

JH asked why do authors have to pay for their own article translation, and if there are no funds for that. HR replied that most universities have a translation service from research support funds so authors can apply to their own university to get translation costs covered. This is usually for texts not in English. However she said that the Journal could look into other funding avenues.

David Shumway (DS) observed that IASPM journal does not seem to have any institutional support like other journals have. HR replied that IASPM is the publisher. DS observed that most journals have an institutional home for office space often in graduate spaces. HR replied that in that case the journal would be owned by that institution. DS replied that it would have been the opposite, since the institution agrees due to the prestige gained from hosting the journal. HR said that she could only talk about her own institution, where support for particular software was grudgingly given as it was the IASPM journal independent of the university; and that it would be great to have institutional support, though.

MU observed that there were two issues: the Advisory Board members change and the link to the University of Liverpool, which is now no longer working as well as it should be. In the case of the Journal the institution needs to be close to the Editor-in-Chief.

HR said that another related discussion at the July 1 meeting was about being associated with a particular publisher, and that there were concerns about publishers' ownership claims; HR also felt it was important that the journal remained open access and a collective venture: the Journal priority at the moment is to have two issues per year and then go for indexing.

MU enquired whether it was possible to have prizes for best articles from the conference celebrated in the journal. HR replied that they were going to start doing that with a special section for prize winning essays.

Regarding the issue of making the Journal hosted by an institution, GP stated that there could be problems with the changing environment and the financial constraints of HE in the UK; it would be fine to have institutional links, but institutions would want some recognition in exchange and the journal could end having less autonomy in relation to REF2020 interests. Eric Weiss observed that the editors for the *Journal of Popular Music Studies*, which is US-based, get the support of their universities. These arrangements do not require anything in exchange, so it would be worth considering them as in some cases they have been successful. GP said that perhaps HR could test this out.

GP asked MU about her comment that the Liverpool office is not working as well as it should be and, if that is the case, what IASPM should do about it. MU replied that it is supposed to house the IASPM archive and that the list is housed there and for that reason is not very manageable. Steve Waksman (SW) brought up the fact that, without going into detail or mentioning individuals, there were things happening at that institution which could bring IASPM into disrepute. He felt that IASPM should be prepared to respond to this issue, because the Association has a lot of our institutional memory housed there. FF stated that he thought there would be proposals put forward at the end of the meeting, in the AOB discussion. GP stated that he would have put a proposal then.

FF mentioned that, as IASPM is based in Sweden, officially we might apply for European Union money although he was not sure of the regulations regarding ERC support for journals and other research activities.

FF asked for the approval of the IASPM Journal report. The report was approved by the floor.

4. IASPM 2015 Conference Report

RdS read the IASPM 2015 Conference report [available at http://www.iaspm.net/archive/2013-2015_IASPM_EC_Report.pdf]. To that report, RdS added more information regarding the conference abstracts book: RdS stressed that, due to an unforeseen, last minute budget cut, the OC was forced not to print the abstract book in full, for unsustainable cost implications.

FF said there was no need to approve this report, only to thank RdS for chairing the OC and for organizing the conference. GP thanked RdS and Professor Edras Rodrigues, and stressed the importance for IASPM members of accepting differences in conference organisation across nations. GP then thanked RdS again for all his hard work.

5. IASPM Chairs Meeting Report

SM read the minutes of the IASPM Chairs meeting report, held on June 30 [available at http://www.iaspm.net/archive/IASPM_Chairs_Minutes_2015-06-30.pdf].

FF asked for any comments on the report.

GP observed that item 6 in the agenda would have dealt with branch lists and their access.

JH said that there had been discussion on whether we should have branch chair meetings in the past, and thought it was so helpful we should always have one at future conferences. GP agreed that the meeting was very useful and good to keep doing this every conference.

FF asked for the approval of the report and of its actions. The report was approved by the floor.

6. IASPM Branches Lists

GP said that the recommendation at the Chair meeting was that members can join more than one list through guest membership to additional lists, on a case by case basis. GP also observed that the process for joining extra lists will be worked out by the EC in the next few months, and that more perspectives and information can be gained by participating in more than one list.

FF asked for the approval of the specific recommendation, which was approved by the floor.

7. Conference Proceedings

GP stated that the issue was discussed in his report and during the chairs meeting, and that a way to move forward was to make the local OC responsible for conference proceedings. DS stated that this was not an accurate account of the chairs meeting: the consensus was that the EC is not responsible for proceedings, but that a local OC can decide whether or not to publish proceedings. GP replied that he perhaps had not been clear in his recap, as that is what he intended to say. If local circumstances are in favour of proceedings then, as is the case in Brazil, it is up to the local OC to publish them.

MU observed that proceedings in Brazil are very important: full papers are sent and are peer-reviewed for proceedings publication, and many organisations use proceedings, not journal articles. MU felt that IASPM needed to discuss the nature of proceedings, papers and extended abstracts on the international scene, she observed that IASPM is not a 'job agency', it is for giving out information on the current research field, rather than for research ratings for individual careers.

A member mentioned that funding from universities is dependent on paper publications in journals. JH said that leaving the publication of the proceedings as the responsibility of the local organisers would solve most of these issues, as advanced planning and extended abstracts in advance are possible.

FF stated that when IASPM was created, in 1981, the proceedings were published in a book and received academic point: that was another era, with only 50 papers per conference. Now proceedings are not weighted for academic credit and special issues come from conferences but are often in effect proceedings. We are not responsible for how each country evaluates academic work. Young scholars need papers published and more would attend conferences if they knew their papers were definitely going to be published. We need to consider both aspects separately.

Louis Weingarten stated that part of the value of conferences is to try out and test ideas and that a paper may not be in its definitive final form. Conversely papers that are in final form may already be under contract to a journal or as a chapter in a book and editors may pursue the issue of prior publication. Two reasons why proceedings are not practical.

Another member asked if it would be possible when submitting/enrolling to opt in or out of conference proceedings. This would make it clear to the local committee.

GP observed that in the IASPM statutes there is no mention of proceedings, but that it has been common practice that some EC members contributed in their editing and publishing. The EC is not responsible for them, and he thinks that if a local OC needs or wants to publish proceedings, then they would have to establish an editorial committee and the form they will take (e.g. printed or online). GP concluded by asking: Is IASPM always committed to publish proceedings, or devolves this responsibility to the local OC. A member stated that this didn't respond to the previous point.

JH remarked that templates can provide options (abstracts, extended abstracts) for submission using conference software and this can be automated.

SW raised a cautionary note that no successful proceedings have been published since 2001, because of the workload. More independent editorial committee might help. DS said that in the US conference proceedings count for nothing A member restated that funding is not obtainable through proceedings. Samantha Bennett (SB) said that the ANZ branch produces a post conference edited collection, not proceedings, and that only delegates can submit.

HR observed that proceedings take years to complete and that to stay relevant they need to come out quickly. IASPM members are always welcome to submit articles from the conference to the IASPM journal: these are peer-reviewed and separate from records of a conference.

MU reminded the members that PKP has an open conference system software through which presenters can upload their abstracts and extended abstracts. She also observed that a committee different from the OC is needed for editing. A member agreed that there should be a proceedings committee.

FF stated that it is not in the GM power to create a new committee, but that the EC can appoint people to discuss this possibility and put a proposal in for 2017 GM. He added that the GM can only decide whether we accept the idea the EC should take care of proceedings, or not. GP replied that the EC cannot take care of proceedings, as per statutes and rules. MU observed that the EC has to make sure all IASPM members know what is happening at a conference. A member suggested that the decision should be left to the next conference OC, inviting IASPM members to get in touch if they want to help on this issue.

DS observed that it seems odd that the GM can't change the IASPM statutes. FF replied that any proposals to change the statutes have to be submitted 30 days before the GM, in order to protect IASPM against a possible hijacking of the assembly, and that this rule is in the statutes since 1981.

FF asked if anyone wanted to move a suggestion and a proposal for changes for the next conference? KZ replied that a proceedings committee should have been set up by the new EC in order to consider the automated system or the peer review with a streamlined process for conference proceedings. This proposal was approved by the floor.

8. IASPM Book Prize

FF read the 2015 IASPM Book Prize Jury's Report [available at <http://www.iaspm.net/archive/2015BookPrizeJuryReport.pdf>]. The floor congratulated the winners: Stephen Amico, Special Mention for his *Roll Over, Tchaikovsky! Russian Popular Music and Post-Soviet Homosexuality* (University of Illinois Press, 2014); and Simon Zagorski-Thomas, Main Prize for his *The Musicology of Record Production* (Cambridge University Press, 2014).

9. Election of the 2015-2017 Executive Committee

A Call for Nominations, open to all IASPM members and for all the EC positions, was posted to the IASPM List on March 9, 2015 (deadline: May 29). Reminders were posted to the List on May 1 and on May 25.

SM received by email 14 nominations, which were posted to the List on May 30. One nomination sent after the deadline was not accepted. Subsequently, a nominator withdrew one nomination, and one dissipated vote was recovered and included. The results were therefore as follows:

Chair

Goffredo Plastino

Nominated by Jacopo Conti, Franco Fabbri, Errico Pavese, Hillegonda C. Rietveld, Philip Tagg and Jacopo Tomatis

General Secretary

Sue Miller

Nominated by Goffredo Plastino and Philip Tagg

Rupert Till

Nominated by Sue Miller

Membership Secretary

Jacopo Conti

Nominated by Philip Tagg and Jacopo Tomatis

Ian Rogers

Nominated by Catherine Strong

Treasurer

No nominations received

Web / Publications

Ed Montano

Nominated by Shelley Brunt and Catherine Strong

Member at Large

No nominations received

Member at Large

No nominations received

Based on the nominations received, three members of the current EC were prepared to stand for re-election: Sue Miller, Ed Montano and Goffredo Plastino. Sara Jansson, Laura Francisca Jordán González, Alejandro L. Madrid and Martha Ulhôa decided to step down from their roles. The nominees for the vacant positions were identified through discussions within the EC and with representatives of IASPM branches.

The current EC therefore advanced the following nominations for the 2015-2017 EC:

Chair

Goffredo Plastino

Nominated by Jacopo Conti, Franco Fabbri, Errico Pavese, Hillegonda C. Rietveld, Philip Tagg and Jacopo Tomatis

General Secretary

Sue Miller

Nominated by Goffredo Plastino and Philip Tagg

Membership Secretary

Jacopo Conti

Nominated by Philip Tagg and Jacopo Tomatis

Treasurer

Emília Barna

Nominated by Laura Francisca Jordán González

Web / Publications

Ed Montano

Nominated by Shelley Brunt and Catherine Strong

Member at Large

Ann Werner

Nominated by Sverker Hyltén-Cavallius

Member at Large

Julio Mendivil

Nominated by Goffredo Plastino

FF asked for any comments. JH asked to know more about Ann Werner. GP explained that, as IASPM is legally based in Sweden, the EC has to have a Swedish representative. There were no nominations, so the Sweden Branch put forward AW, who accepted to be a Member at Large.

FF asked for the approval of the 2015-2017 EC: all delegates, bar 2, approved the new EC.

FF thanked the outgoing members of the EC: AM, MU, LJ and SJ.

10. Next International Conference

GP said that the EC received one bid for the IASPM 2017 Conference, to be hosted at the University of Kassel, Germany. It was submitted by JH, and was fully supported by the IASPM D-A-CH Branch. JH posted a document regarding this application to the IASPM List on June 12, 2015; and a similar document is also available at http://www.iaspm.net/archive/IASPM2017_proposal.pdf.

JH gave a presentation on the 2017 conference venue.

GP said that the EC also received one bid for the IASPM 2019 Conference, to be hosted at the School of Music, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia. It was been submitted by Samantha Bennett, and was fully supported by the IASPM ANZ Branch. The document is available at http://www.iaspm.net/archive/IASPM2019_proposal.pdf.

SB gave a presentation on the 2019 conference venue.

GP said that other proposals for the 2019 conference were welcome, since a decision on the 2019 conference would have not be made until the 2017 GM. FF stated however that a vote on Canberra could have taken place. A vote was held and the 2019 Canberra bid was approved.

11. AOB

GP brought up the issue of skype presentations at conferences, which was discussed at length in the international list. He gave a summary of the issues raised on the list and asked for comments. JH suggested a trial skype section during Kassell 2017 streaming section, and to evaluate it at the next AGM. A member underlined the interaction issues after skype presentations. Another member said that he liked JH's proposal of the streaming pilot at Kassell. FF asked if members wanted to move this idea as a proposal. The proposal was approved.

MU returned to the proceedings issue and, after making reference to the statutes, asked about a GM decision on them. JH replied that Kassell OC will try out options to see what works best. FF observed that the fact that the statutes say that IASPM promotes publications doesn't mean that the GM decides who makes the publications. He also pointed out that IASPM has over 1000 members, and that there were only 30 of them present at the GM in Campinas. GP observed that practicable solutions needed to be found, but that the EC cannot interfere with the local OC on that issue.

JH asked about possible dates for the conference (earlier or later than the usual end of June). It was stressed by many members that many could not make earlier dates in June, due to administrative obligations. The last week in June was preferred. JH then asked about expanding a student graduate conference volunteer system internationally, with cheap youth hostel accommodation and possible funding, and he asked whether members were in favour. GF observed that IASPM conference funding priorities are related to grants.

GF returned to the issues related to the IPM in Liverpool, mentioning also the issues related to popular music studies in Italy, as underlined in the petition put forward by Philip Tagg and himself. He then asked if he should have acted on these issues with a full mandate as IASPM chair or only as an individual, as in the petition. SW stated that the IPM is under pressure, and that this is a delicate subject and therefore a difficult and sensitive area. He said that there is grounds for IASPM as an organisation to stand up for individuals and take a position, but also that we need to be attentive to the larger situation, as it may impact on IASPM. DS asked if members wanted GP to speak on IASPM's behalf in support of members who are under attack. Catherine Strong (CS) stated that a consultation before would have been wise. FF observed that the power of representing the organisation is implicit in the establishing of the chair, and that the setting up of IASPM was also a political gesture. CS replied that that was generally understood, but that signing a public letter is a different action and should be done as an individual, or that a procedure for consultation should precede such actions. FF replied that the chair is democratically elected. One member asked where would a line be drawn, and that these processes would need to be formalised. Another member stated that a draft letter is usually presented in many organisations, before any public letter being sent. GP pointed out that in the case of a consultation on the list on a draft letter it would be hard to know when a discussion is over, unless a deadline is introduced. He added that with no mandate he would act as an individual. FF asked for a motion from DS proposal, i.e. if members wanted GP to speak on IASPM's behalf in support of members who are under attack. FF then asked for DS' motion to be approved and it was approved by the floor.

JH asked if EC members could be nominated during the conference, and added that he wanted to propose a change in nomination procedure for 2017 and 2019. FF replied that a change to the statutes could only be proposed before the 2017 conference, and discussed and approved at 2017 GM. SM stated that very few nominations were received at first, and face to face discussion regarding nominations is good. GP stressed again that proposal for changes must be submitted a month before the GM at the latest. He pointed out that many IASPM members are not attending the GM, and that the nomination process must be inclusive, reaching all members. He also suggested putting out calls for nominations earlier on the list. DS stated that the current system is in theory democratic, but with so few nominations it isn't working.

The GM concluded at 12:04.