

IASPM Executive Committee Meeting

29 June 2012 (teleconference)

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

Agenda

1. Approval of previous meeting minutes
2. IASPM 2013 Conference
 - 2.1 Report by the track directors
 - 2.2 Peer-review: general issues
 - 2.3 Conference organisation: general issues
3. Other matters
4. Time and agenda for the next meeting

2.1 Report by the track directors

Each member of the Executive Committee makes a report about the track (stream) they are responsible for.

Martha (track 1) confirms that the process of peer-review has been completed successfully. She suggests including comments in the rejection letter. She warns that we need to check if there are any authors who have submitted multiple papers.

Carlo (track 2) suggests adding two more accepted proposals for each stream, considering that very probably there will be withdrawals. This means that, excluding panels, there will be 389 accepted proposals (ten more than initially planned). However, in order to avoid the risk of overcrowding the sessions, we may identify ten more posters instead.

Héctor (track 3) would like to move the panel 'Music and policy in LA in 21th century' to a different stream, but it does not seem to fit in any. An author sent two proposals: one on his own, one with another. As a general policy, it is stated that, in case of multiple proposals, only one can be accepted.

Laura (track 4) recognises that the theme of her stream is broader in scope, so that it is hard to reject proposals on the basis of relevance.

Ed (track 5) suggests moving the panel entitled 'Is there popular music out there? Challenging the mainstream' to a different track. Carlo agrees that it would fit better the second track. Martha, however, believes that it fits the fifth track.

2.2 Peer-review: general issues

Martha reminds the track directors to check if the reviewers for their stream have left any comment also for the author and, in case, to delete them in order to avoid misunderstandings with the authors.

By Tuesday 3 June, each track director will prepare two Excel spreadsheets, one with the accepted proposals and one with rejected ones respectively. Eduardo will merge them in a single spreadsheet. This will allow us seeing if there are multiple submissions by the same author.

Carlo suggests using standard regret letters specifying the main reason/s for the rejection. The Executive approves.

Eduardo will prepare an official acceptance letter with the University letterhead. This document will be useful especially for those who need to apply for visa and/or for grants. Acceptance letters, as well as regret letters, will be bilingual.

2.3 Conference organisation: general issues

Eduardo will check how much place is available for posters, which depends on negotiation with different institutions. One option would be to have ten different posters each day. Héctor suggests booking a theatre, which would be large enough to have all the posters in the same place at the same time. In any case, Eduardo and Héctor will arrange for a space to host posters.

Eduardo plans to have film screenings during lunchtime, as it is the only time that would fit within the schedule.

The conference organising team agrees on some general norms about the conference structure:

- Discussants for panels that have been accepted are accepted too.
- Panel participants are free to arrange the structure of their panel as they wish, as long as it stays within the given time for a session, i.e., 2 hours. As a corollary, the number of participants in a panel is open.
- Plenary sessions will be organized at a later stage.

Martha raises the issue of the double language: how are the two languages going to be integrated in the programme? This issue will be discussed in the next meeting.

3. Other matters

On 29 June 2012, Violeta, IASPM treasurer, sent this Email to the IASPM executive mailing list:

Due to Jan's situation, the bank is willing to accept a set of meeting minutes in which we decide that Jan is to be taken off the account. Can we also decide who should be on the account? Maybe we should make this an IASPM policy... i.e to have the chair, and membership secretary /treasurer team? And secretary? See what you think. For when this is decided then I will liaise with those who need to be taken off/added on for further steps.

It is agreed that the executive will have another meeting as soon as possible to discuss about signatures on the IASPM bank account.

4. Time and agenda for the next meeting

If necessary, the Executive will have another meeting to discuss conference-related issues before sending the acceptance/rejection letters. If not, we will discuss through the mailing list.
