

IASPM Executive Committee

IASPM Executive Committee Skype Meeting

Saturday 11 January 2014

Present: Goffredo Plastino, Laura Jordán, Ed Montano, Martha Ulhoa, Sue Miller, Rafael Dos Santos, Alejandro Madrid (missing the initial discussion)

Absent: Sara Jansson

Chair: Goffredo Plastino

Minutes: Sue Miller

Agenda

1. 2015 Conference

a. Agreed and further deadlines

All present agreed on the deadlines and Rafael Dos Santos said all were practicable for the organising committee. GP accepted these deadlines.

b. Theme and strands

The theme of 'Time and Popular Music' was accepted as the main over-arching theme with sub strand themes to be chosen to fit with this. As March 1 is the deadline for the Call for Papers to go out GP asked LJ to prepare a draft introductory paragraph for the CFP as she had the idea initially. EM offered to help LJ with this. MU then suggested each member of the executive propose a particular strand theme for the draft CFP for us to discuss via email and develop before sending to the academic committee.

c. Organizing Committee

GP asked about who might join the organising committee led by Rafael Dos Santos from the Latin American Branch of IASPM. RdS asked MU and LJ for suggestions. GP set a deadline for one month's time for this. MU and LJ in agreement.

MU reminded the committee that the organising committee was independent from the academic committee.

GP remarked that the Gijón programme credited a conference coordinator alongside a track director and asked what this role entailed. EM said this role was for each person in charge of each conference theme strand.

d. Academic Committee

There was some discussion here as to who made up the academic committee and whether executive committee members were also involved or not. AM remarked that usually these were independent of each other. MU said that an academic committee had been set up to help with the paper selections but that the executive committee put the program together, inviting academics from various branches depending on their areas of expertise.

Whilst acknowledging that ideally the executive committee and the academic committee should be independent in reality adding two layers of decision making was not practicable and so a compromise was needed. EM stressed the need for the executive committee to be part of the academic committee as we are in charge of putting the program together. GP raised the fact that at the chair's meeting in Gijón there was a recommendation for all branches to be represented on the academic committee but that this would be too complicated and time consuming in practice. EM said there were 500 abstracts sent last year. AM said most conferences receive 1000 as standard and require 8 people to select papers. GP requested we make this all clear in the minutes that we have considered the chair's recommendations and sought a practicable solution. GP sought clarification on the role of academic committees – for review and selection of abstracts? MU stated that 5 or 6 themes needed to be identified by the executive committee and then to form a partnership with members of the academic committee regarding paper selection (suggesting 5 members of the executive committee plus 5 members of the academic committee). AM suggested only one member of the exec to be on the academic committee (one with previous experience of the process). EM felt this would not be practicable. AM said he would not feel comfortable being on the AC. EM raised the possibility of there not being enough volunteers from the AC to select papers. GP said we can set deadlines and ask others when there's no response. GP agreed that theoretically the AC should be separate from the EC but that in practice this could be impracticable.

EM suggested we should review abstracts according to stream and GP asked how this might work.

A discussion on whether we needed streams was instigated by AM as some might get excluded from participating if their research fell outside of these areas. It was agreed after discussion that a paragraph on the main theme of Time followed by 5 or 6 streams could then be followed by a more general statement welcoming abstracts for popular music research outside of these areas.

GP felt that the EC should be involved in the reading and reviewing of abstracts for the sake of organisation drawing on help and expertise from the academic committee. EC members were therefore de facto members of the academic committee unless individual members decide not to be (individual's choice). AM stated he would only be part of the EC. SM agreed that with this compromise the program could be set efficiently whilst nevertheless through dialogue with the branches and the academic committee.

EM said that it was after all the EC's responsibility to organise the conference program.

GP said that asking each branch rep to nominate a member of the academic committee was not practicable but that members of the AC should be ideally from a spread of IASPM branches. Thus the AC will comprise members of the EC comfortable with this and invited members of the AC in accordance with the chairs of each branch. LJ asked if selection would be done through asking the branches. GP said we would decide which branches to approach (e.g. France) and ask them to recommend someone within a strict timeframe (deadline) and that he would write to the branches.

LJ said that although it is her second time on the EC she was still a PhD student so perhaps not qualified to select papers. GP said that it was fine for her to opt out and that we need to define the rules on this at the next general meeting in Brazil – proposing a motion to define the rules more clearly.

SM so for now we undertake a practical compromise.

A discussion on strands or no strands led back to item b. and RdS and MU stated a preference for conference strands as this was easier to organise in terms of working groups (see point b for outcomes of this discussion).

e. Extended abstracts

These were rejected by the EC and RdS was also against having these 2000 word abstracts for the proceedings as this is not practicable due to time and lack of editor volunteers. All agreed normal abstracts will be sufficient.

f. IASPM Book Prize

MU: we need to make the call and set a deadline 6 months before the conference.

Books need to have been published by 1 January 2015. This will be discussed at a later stage.

AOB regarding the conference

Rafael Dos Santos asked about the conference website. EM told him you need to organise a separate site for registration, travel, location and program, and the IASPM site will have a linked separate site for abstract submissions. EM agreed to send links about websites and the website link for the last conference in Spain and help out if necessary.

RDS also suggested one day of the conference in Sao Paulo for a day of cultural activities that are run by SESC. SM suggested this could happen one day before the conference. MU asked about transport there and GP said yes in principle for either the day before the conference or at the very end of the conference after the GM. SM and GF both pointed out that these cultural activities are usually organised as a conference extra for an extra one day before or one day after the conference. All agreed this could be something special and a good thing.

LJ raised the issue of languages in terms of whether the conference will be bilingual. AM said the call for papers should be in Portuguese as well as English and MU said that people could present the abstract in Portuguese or Spanish with English translation and that presentations would need PowerPoints with English subtitles. RDS said that the conference was in an international arena and so English translations would also be needed. AM pointed out the conference was in Brazil so Portuguese was needed. MU pointed out the Latin American branch of IASPM was involved and therefore the conference needed to be trilingual English, Portuguese and Spanish with abstracts in English and the call for papers trilingual.

RDS left the meeting at this point.

2. Web & Publications: status quo and issues (EM)

EM reported that hosting arrangements with PKP for the journal and conference websites was under discussion. Also noted that he had no offers of help with English editing of 2013 conference proceedings and so this had not been done.

GP asked who could help with editing of proceedings and MU said that we need to decide before the next conference as to how conference proceedings could be undertaken with editors and co-editors chosen in advance. GP said the website is looking good. EM said the old design was clunky and he was still experimenting. GP asked EM to email IASPM list when the website is finished so that all could look at the new site. AM asked about a page showing the history of the book prize listing previous winners.

3. Membership: status quo and issues (AM)

AM has been updating the membership lists but only the US and New Zealand have been done so far - he has no access to the server with the password and login given so cannot add new members directly himself but has to send these via email to the Treasurer. He has been asking each Treasurer in each branch the names of members and then sending

requests to LJ to add to the list server. LJ said treasurers were asked to send their 2013 members lists by the last week of February then she can charge them in March sending out invoices to branches.

4. Treasury: status quo and issues (LJ)

LJ: no other issues to report

5. IASPM Journal

GP has been in touch with the editor of the IASPM Journal, Hillegonda Rietveld. As an update she has edited two issues of the journal each calendar year. Areas of concern: some people get back quickly about reviews and others are less prompt in terms of peer review. Also she gets no remuneration for attending the general conference: all in the executive felt that she should be funded to come to the general conference in Brazil and all were in agreement for her to be funded to attend as the IASPM Journal is an important part of the organisation.

6. IASPM lists: update

Regarding the opening up of lists only three branches have responded so far. GP stated that if nothing comes from the next round of emails he will forward the discussion on the general list and then raise the issue at the general meeting in Brazil. AM pointed out that the US does not have a list serve branch.

7. AOB

None.

8. Date of next meeting: March 2014 (date tbc)

It was agreed that the next meeting would be late March but that the draft of the conference theme and the strands needed to be worked on in the next month and that people for the academic committee needed to be identified as soon as we can.