

**Minutes of the IASPM Chairs Meeting  
Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Brazil**

**30 June 2015**

IASPM Executive Committee members present: Goffredo Plastino, Chair (GP), and Sue Miller, General Secretary (SM)

Those attending were either the chairs or representatives on behalf of chairs not at the conference:

IASPM D-A-CH — Jan Hemming, on behalf of Susanne Binas-Preisendörfer

IASPM Francophone — Olivier Julien

IASPM Hungary — Emilia Barna

IASPM Italia — Franco Fabbri on behalf of Francesco D'Amato

IASPM Japan — Hiroshi Agawa

IASPM South Korea — Hyunjoon Shin

IASPM AL — Heloisa Valente, on behalf of Julio Mendivil

IASPM Norden — Hans T. Zeiner-Henriksen

IASPM Benelux — Koos Zwaan and Pauwke Berkens

IASPM España — Silvia Martínez, representing Eduardo Viñuela

IASPM UK and Ireland — Matt Brennan, on behalf of Rupert Till

IASPM USA — David Shumway, on behalf of Mark Butler

IASPM ANZ — Samantha Bennett

GF stated that there was no agenda but that he would be bringing up issues discussed by the EC and by the branches during the last two years, for chair's views and ideas. Introductions were made first (see list above).

**1. Improving communication between branches, and between the branches and the EC**

***Lists: open, closed or guest membership?***

A mixed picture of open and closed lists across branches and the pros and cons of open and closed lists and the practicalities of volunteer-led management of these was discussed. Korea's chair (HS) affirmed there was no list for their branch; Spain (SiM) that they shared one with SIBE and that this was a closed list; Hungary (EB) affirmed they had an open list but that it was partly in Hungarian language. The UK list seems to be an open one and MB stated that the process of joining and deleting members was a difficult one. France (OJ) said that their list was in theory an open list but in French so again language issues regarding international intent were present. Japan (HA) does not have a list. The Netherlands list is open, whereas the Norden branch only has a mailing not posting list as they use the international list for that (in English), using their own Facebook group for posts in Finnish. Italy (FF) has a closed list formally but there are many on the list who are no longer paid up members of IASPM. Similarly, the US list is formally closed but not all on the list are currently paid up members. MB stated that the Canada list was closed, but again this is not policed re subscription, as membership secretaries are voluntary.

The international list is used mostly by UK and US members.

Rather than have all open or closed lists a compromise was suggested by GF: IASPM members can join more than one list through guest membership to additional lists on a case by case basis but, as suggested by KZ, with a clear page on the international website with names of current chair and membership secretary and a hyperlink to the respective national branches. It was agreed that a clear process for asking for guest membership to the extra list would make this an easier solution (MB, JF, FF, SM). The proposal was agreed.

GP asked for chairs to send updated information and that changes (e.g. to branch committee members and roles) be communicated to the EC, so that the EC webmaster can update the international website. KZ stated the need for links to national branches from the website, alongside the names for each branches' chair and membership secretary, followed by the hyperlink to that national branch clearly on the main IASPM website.

### ***Newsletter***

GP proposed a January newsletter (two pages minimum) from each branch, to be sent to the EC for publication on the international site, with any updates in personnel, contact details, new publications, latest news, conferences, etc. The newsletter was considered a good idea. It would keep members updated of scholarly work across the board, and links could be included for those that then want to know more.

## **2. Conference Proceedings**

A discussion on the relevance of conference proceedings led to some proposed solutions to take into account national differences in their importance. Proceedings are important in Spain and other Latin American countries where funding is dependent on there being a document of this nature. Elsewhere (e.g. US & the UK) proceedings are no longer valued in terms of research outputs (DS). As stated by the US chair (DS) any large organisations such as AMS do not publish proceedings as peer-reviewed articles in journals carry more weight. It was however pointed out that it is useful for those unable to attend the conference to get an idea of research in the current field, 'a snapshot of current research trends' (HV). It is also a training ground for postgraduate students (an entry point into the academic world of publishing). There are funding implications in LA with conference proceedings attributing ISBN to (online) papers. There was some discussion as to whether this would still be the case in the future and also the problem of those outside this system not wanting their conference papers published in proceedings (e.g. as articles may be accepted elsewhere in peer review journals with exclusivity contracts — KZ). JF said we should encourage IASPM members to submit articles to the IASPM journal to improve the visibility of research from all IASPM branches. MB underlined the importance of a system that does not disenfranchise so an online system for the conference local organisers would be the most practicable.

Due to the difficulties of time involved for editing and quality control (and translation and peer review) GP stated that the EC cannot undertake such work, but that Organising Committees can choose if and how to create proceedings themselves. The local Organising Committee would need to take responsibility for maintaining the standards of published proceedings and ensure they have funding for it within their conference budget.

There are as yet no proceedings for Gijón 2013, but there are plans to produce these at the same time as those for Campinas 2015, possibly online (SiM).

Jan Hemming (JH) mentioned software platforms which allow delegates to upload pdf abstracts and extended abstracts themselves and these are not edited, as they are the responsibility of the individual presenters. Conference programs often file information for organisers too (programmes, abstracts etc.) – this was felt to be something to research for future conferences as a practicable solution can be found to accommodate both perspectives (JH, DS, HA and KZ).

Quality control was discussed and it was proposed that local Organising Committees had to take that responsibility which needed to be included in the conference funding proposal and budget (MB, KZ, GP).

The Spain representative (SiM) also emphasized the need to be clear about arrangements for proceedings at the outset.

### **3. IASPM Journal**

It was felt that IASPM members should be encouraged to submit to the IASPM journal to improve the visibility of research by all members everywhere.

### **4. AOB**

Some branches have undertaken joint conferences and these have been very beneficial – interbranch collaborations have been very fruitful, alongside partnerships with other societies. BENELUX ran a joint conference with the Francophone branch which worked well (KZ, PB). MB stated that UK priorities have been to collaborate with other societies within the UK (e.g. the HEA Higher Education Academy) and that these events have been very fruitful particularly as costs are shared (these are in addition to the annual UK and Ireland conference). OJ stated France had not had an annual conference for nine years. Norden chair (HZH) stated their collaboration with ARP was successful and DS stated that the US branch has worked with SAM and Experience Music organisations.

There was a question regarding setting up new branches, such as one for Taiwan and one for Hong Kong (HS), and JF suggested a larger association to cover these countries such as NORDEN, LA and DACHS.