

IASPM Executive Committee Meeting

9 May 2012 (teleconference)

Participants: Martha Tupinambá de Ulhôa (Chair), Carlo Nardi (General Secretary), Ed Montano, Héctor Fouce, Eduardo Viñuela (IASPM 2013 conference host).

Agenda

1. Conference
 - 1.1 Brief update from the conference host
 - 1.2 Brief update on keynote speakers
 - 1.3 Conference structure
 - 1.4 Reviewing process
 - 1.5 Definition of review criteria and guidelines
 - 1.6 Summary
2. Update about the copyright committee
3. Update on the IASPM 2011 Proceedings
4. Other matters
5. Time and agenda for the next meeting

1. Conference

1.1 Brief update from the conference host

Eduardo stresses the high number of submissions – 501, including both individual presentations and panels. He is going to try to accommodate as many delegates as possible. Poster presentations will allow us to invite more delegates.

1.2 Brief update on keynote speakers

Héctor and Martha have brought two of the keynote speakers, Francisco Cruces Villalobos and Sarah Cohen, in touch. Martha will make them write and send their presentations in advance so that there is enough time to have it translated. The executive will take care of the translation. A handout of their presentation will be printed for the audience, while keynote speakers will speak in their native language. Eduardo will investigate whether it is possible to have instant translation during this session. Héctor volunteers to chair this session.

1.3 Conference structure

Martha suggests that, rather than considering a waitlist, we should accept a higher number of proposals than the figure that we expect for the actual conference. In this way, we will initially plan seven parallel sessions and then, once we have the definitive number of delegates, reschedule the sessions, cutting to six streams if necessary. Eduardo confirms that, hypothetically, there is room up to eight parallel sessions.

However, we agree that seven streams is a reasonable compromise between organisational needs and the expansion of the participation. Eduardo will consequently book the rooms required.

We agree on one-hour sessions for individual keynote speakers. This will leave 45 minutes that be used for a meeting of the chairs of IASPM regional branches and for other institutional meetings. Martha will liaise with the regional chairs to organise this meeting. Héctor suggests scheduling these meetings. Accordingly, this space will be publicised as informal meeting time and as an opportunity for poster presentations. Eduardo will book rooms for this purpose.

The academic committee has to decide which proposals are suitable for presentation as posters. There will be fifty posters.

The opening ceremony with regional and academic authorities is scheduled on Monday at midday before the first keynote speaker.

The General Meeting will take place on Thursday at 6pm, followed by the official dinner at 8pm. This should hopefully contribute to higher attendance at the GM. The first Friday afternoon session will host presentations that can appeal to a wider audience; after that, the last keynote speaker and the conference close. We will ask some members to review the conference and bring some points during the close.

1.4 Reviewing process

We will do open peer-review. We will send a database on a separate sheet to the reviewers. For the future, Martha will make a motion to the GM about submitting papers before the conference.

The rejection quota for each stream will be proportional to the number of submissions within that particular stream.

We need extra-reviewers for Spanish, precisely one for Ed's stream and one for Carlo's. Celsa Alonso and Héctor will help Ed, Martha will help Carlo.

We agree on not setting a quota for Spanish presentations. Martha suggests inviting Spanish-speakers to use a powerpoint in English. Eduardo suggests that also English-speaking presenters could include a Powerpoint in Spanish. Martha reminds that the official language of IASPM is English, while Eduardo argues that Spanish is an official languages of the conference. Héctor and Eduardo will work to address this issue, that still raises controversy both among the Spanish-speaking members as well as among the English-speaking ones. They will encourage people to include information in English, or to reply to questions in English. Héctor will write a statement to encourage people to prepare the translation if they are going to talk in Spanish.

1.5 Definition of review criteria and guidelines

There are authors who have made more than one proposal. However, as far as we

need to reject many papers, we will allow only for one presentation per member.

For panels with more than four presentations there will be no limit of participants, the only limit being the given timeframe. It is true that there are several proposals about festivals, yet they are not necessarily to be included in the same panel.

We agree on using a form, modelled on the ASARP form, that considers two main criteria, quality and relevance. Quality includes three sub-criteria, namely (1) originality and importance; (2) coherence, structure and methodology; and (3) understanding of existing scholarship. (Please see the review guidelines attached.)

Next tasks for the Executive members:

- Ed will liaise with the reviewers.
- Carlo will prepare the reviewing form.
- Carlo will write an announcement to the list about the number of submissions and the procedure of peer-reviewing.
- Martha will ask Laura if she needs help with reviewing, due to the high number of submissions in her stream.

1.6 Summary

7 parallel streams (with 4 speakers for each session)
308 individual presentations + 20 plenary speakers + 50 posters
Acceptance letters: 378

6 parallel sessions (with 4 speakers for each session)
284 individual presentations + 20 plenary speakers + 50 posters
354 delegates

Coefficient₁ (acceptance/rejection): 0.75

Coefficient₂ (papers/posters): 0.13

Papers	Stream		Acc./Rej.	Papers/Posters
67	» S1.1950 (Martha)	«	50/17	44/6 (50)
77	» S2.MARG (Carlo)	«	58/19	50/8 (58)
58	» S3.COPY (Héctor)	«	44/14	38/6 (44)
184	» S5.MOV (Laura)	«	138/46	120/18 (138)
119	» S5.PLACE (Ed)	«	89/30	12/77 (89)
505	» TOTAL	«	379/126	50/329 (379)

2. Update about the copyright committee

Héctor will present an ambitious and documented proposal to the end of May. He is going to develop two ideas from Philip Tagg: (1) to produce a document with IASPM position; and (2) to use it to move towards decision makers, both at national and

international fields.

3. Update on the IASPM 2011 Proceedings

Carlo, Ed and Jacopo Tomatis are currently working on the proceedings from IASPM 2011 Grahamstown conference. We have received a satisfactory number of contributions (47, 5 of which are from previous conferences), both in proportion to the number of delegates attending the conference (42/104) and as compared to previous conference proceedings (e.g., the Liverpool proceedings include 44 contributions). Moreover, this is an opportunity to publish work on African music, that is still underrepresented in international publications. Among the factors that have possibly lead to this positive result are use of the Open Conference System, the registration of an ISSN number, the repeated personal messages to encourage delegates to submit their paper. Yet, there have been some issues, first with Michael Drewett's withdrawal, then with the English language with non-native speakers. Furthermore, we need to find a more efficient way to work, delegating the formatting and spelling work on the authors. Unfortunately, not everyone has been collaborative enough in this sense. The reviewing process is almost finished. Carlo is helping Jacopo with formatting and Ed is doing extra proof-reading. Jacopo has worked tirelessly on the layout, smoothing out any incongruence in the referencing style. There has been a slight delay, but I hope that we can publish the proceedings in July at the latest.

4. Other matters

Martha is working on the cross-ref for the IASPM@Journal. She will check if it is possible to use the same number for the IASPM Proceedings DOI.

5. Time and agenda for the next meeting

We plan to have a meeting shortly before the reviewing process starts in about ten days. We will set a time and an agenda through the mailing list.
