June 10, 2017

**ISPME meeting, Thessaly University, Volos, Greece 10 June 2017**

**Patrick S. called the meeting to order: 12:52 pm**

**Patrick made a motion to approve the meeting agenda at Thessaly University, Volos, Greece, June 10, 2017: approved.**

**Patrick asked about whether or not there is suggestion about new discussion.**

Estelle J. proposed new business to discuss about PMER.

Patrick made a motion to approve the new agenda: approved

**Patrick shared the minutes from the last business meeting** **in Frankfurt, 2015 (Please see the minutes from the previous meeting for further details)**

Patrick: We don’t know who will attend the general assembly, so it is hard to send the minutes out and share it ahead of time. Once we are ready, we will share the minutes from the last meeting (2015) and this meeting for the next conference. (2017).

* + Feedback from the last conference.
  + We will continue the conversation and talk about the preconference
  + Treasurer report later.
  + Conference venue.
  + Call for next meeting’s site.
  + Challenge for all kinds of organization. We need to decide together about the next site.
  + PMER

**Patrick made a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting: Approved.**

**Feedback to 11th conference 2017**

**Site Chair feedback:**

* Patrick: Panos, any ideas or issues that were brought up to you or thoughts you have about how we carry it to the future? Also, I would like to thank him one more time for leading this site here on behalf of the society. This is a collective effort. A number of us worked on it and for sure, Eva, as a chair, has enormous impact upon that. Thank you, Eva.
* Panos K.: I don’t have something concrete to raise. I was thinking about the three chairs. Is it too much? I discuss everything with others. Everyday, or every week, we exchanged email for the past two years.
* Patrick: Thank you, Panos. On item 7, we’ll discuss more about the issue of the structure. I think it’s important to talk about this issue.

**Treasurer Report**

* Theocharis R.: We have good news. This is not final, because the university and the bank charge commissions. We don’t have the final number yet. But so far, we are doing okay.
* Panos: I thank you very much.
* Theocharis: I suggest that for the next conference, we can have conference for one individual day, so that some students could choose to attend for one day.
* Patrick: Thank you. We have that in the minutes and we can certainly discuss further. Are there any other concern or suggestions that you might want to raise in terms of the collection fee and the process here?
* Iris Y.: I am just wondering about what the research committee fee is?
* Panos: Anything goes through them. This structural thing is not new for the university.
* Patrick: They are the cost of doing business through the university.
* Panos: They have financial issues dealing with the outside world. We cannot do anything without them.
* Patrick: We will keep these on the record just as to inform future individuals working on the conference. Some of the items here in terms of print, I found it remarkable that we got the program for 230 euros. Like that’s possible.

**Patrick made a motion to approve the temporary treasury report: Approved.**

* Patrick: The report will be sent out to everybody participating in this conference along with the minutes later.

**Pre-conference**

* Patrick: Cecilia ran that very well. We had seven doctoral students from Canada, Sweden, Mexico, U.S. and Germany. We have very diverse group of people and a fantastic group that volunteered their time to be there. It’s an outstanding aspect of what we do in our society. We will certainly continue to do that in Canada and hopefully, see how we might amplify that in Canada.
* Randall A.: Heidi Westerlund and I started this in Helsinki, then New York, and Frankfurt. This is the best one. It was intimate. We have equal number of senior people and junior. We finally figured it out. One of the problems is that people would register and not come to the pre-conference. That both happened in Frankfurt and in New York. So I want to mention that if we do this again, we have some kind of review process or maybe some kind of obligation so that people come to the pre-conference. The other thing is that I truly do think that Cecilia was part of the reasons for this success. If we could, I would like to nominate her for continuing doing this. It was very meaningful. Cathy, do you want to say something?
* Patrick: If I may just follow up on Randall, Cecilia provided a structure for the pre-conference, sent out communication to students, collected papers, and the papers were distributed among all the participants. All participants responded to all the papers. There was enormous amount of work that everybody came to put it together.
* Estelle: Due to the nature of documenting for what we do, is it possible for us to officially send out letters for those who participated to thank them for what they have done for the society, for example, Joe Abramo. I think it will be very helpful to document these reports for Individuals participating in the society. They should be recognized.
* Patrick: A great idea. So, what you suggested is that individuals participating in the organization ought to be recognized and a letter sent.
* Estelle: Yeah.
* Patrick: I think it will be the joint responsibility of the chair and the site chair communicating back to individuals who participated in the organization of the conference, outlining these individual’s contribution, thanking them and sending out the letter.

**Patrick made a motion to vote Estelle’s suggestion of officially recognizing individuals who contributed: Aye.**

**Discussions about the 12th conference 2019 ISPME in London, Canada.**

* Patrick: We have several people from Western (Ontario) here. I would like to ask if there is any discussion or suggestion in terms of the organization of the conference, any comments ahead of time will be most helpful. Open to forum for suggestions and comments.
* Cathy B.: I really appreciate the 10 am hour after the party. I think maybe we should do that.
* June B. T.: I know we sent out the date. It’ll be helpful to know the time in advance.
* Cathy: I can respond to that. In the past, the issue is that we don’t know how many papers we are going to get. That said, I think we come upon that we have the reception the night before it begins and end on the Sunday. That’s how it begins and then we end on the Sunday.
* June: The assumption is that people know that this conference starts like that.
* Betty- Anne Y.: I think the schedule is posted, at least for this conference, a couple months ago.
* Cathy: It’s hard. Because what if we get a bunch of wonderful papers and we have to start the day before.
* Patrick: So, I think the point is that we release the dates and the time as soon as possible.
* June: Yes, as soon as possible. The timing of the day. I don’t assume that everybody knows that this is the way the conference works. That’s made under the assumption that this is how we do it.
* Patrick: We will certainly work on that. I would like to use an electronic system that Western (Ontario) has used in other conferences. So, people will have the chance to place their full papers and information about that there. Prior to the conference, people can actually be reading and organizing things, knowing that there is always a new version. At least, people can be more proactive. As an international society, we remain with the challenge of going over time, speaking manifestly, reading in comprehension to a very international society. I really would like to see that, the more we can do to facilitate that.
* Estelle: I have a question about how you might advertise this conference. I am sad that this time I don’t see any Finish colleague. I am wondering if we may develop more systematic way of when about and how to promote the conference.
* Alexandra K. W.: Next week, there is another conference, the sociology conference. In this case, I had to decide which conference I want to go. Maybe next time, we can think if it’s possible that it is not at such time.
* Patrick: Being in the committee, I know we have attempted to find some of these things out but it is a challenge. I think it is important that we be aware of it. Other comments? Panos raised the issue of parallel sessions and during the three parallel sessions, we leave some time. I wonder if there is any comment on that. I also heard from a colleague here that the possibility of a format, perhaps multiple format. For instance, experimentation would be that rather than a respondent, individuals would receive the paper in advance, and let’s say, three individuals would be willing to raise questions and begin conversation after the response, rather than another paper read after the presentation. I wonder if there is any consideration regarding the format, an alternative format. I recognize that the respondent also plays a role for some people as a reason to come. Being in the program is an important role. I wonder also if there might be space for multiple formats throughout the three days.
* June: Many places offer multiple formats. One thing that I think we may consider not full length paper. Like 10 minutes, a statement designed to produce a conversation with the people. Because in some of these papers we had a lot of respondents, but some raised very few questions. I think the notion that we put something like, a 10-minutes presentation, might ease the congestion which is designed to speak about the paper and generate discussions. I think that might be a possibility.
* Iris: At the last conference, the panels, it seems to be 3 or 4 independent papers. They didn’t hang together. This time, I thought the respondent to the panels did help bring that together. I think it’s a nice addition.
* Cathy: I think the conference before had attempted to do that but I agree with Iris. I think it was quite lovely.
* Katerina S.: I am speaking from the outside. I feel secure that there is the paper, the response and the discussion. That makes me think more. Now that we speak philosophy.
* Patrick: Individuals mentioned to me that the idea of themes might capture interest from possible submissions, but also the issue of creating some space for a conversation. Maybe that is connected to publication or connected to a fishbowl environment. Those are interesting to think about.
* Betty-Anne: I noticed two big ideas from Patrick and June. It involves the development of the society, how different ideas are integrated upfront not just artificial. This idea that modes are marinating seems to be working and continue. Another is the function for the teachers of the society.
* June: And this directs a possibility of more interaction throughout the community. As we sit here in Greece, I wonder if there is a way to interact with other societies?

Liz G.: Something about having the ear out in the world. Trying to be more connected to the community is important.

* Cathy: I think it’s a shame that we have not been taking group photos every time. Somebody help remember that we need to have group photos.
* Estelle: Maybe we can have a group photo after this meeting. Or we should have it on the first day.
* Patrick: Any other business regarding this?
* Panos: We didn’t manage to reach out the community. I tried to talk to many people. People think what we are doing is our own thing. They are worried about that. I tried to explain. Of course, language is also an issue. I would like to invite people from outside and have some discussion. I think we didn’t think of this clear. Envision something. You have to feel how it would work with a lot of things. At the same time, I am sorry for that. People would benefit from that.
* Liz: My perspective was that I think it will be very exciting to have some people to participate with this keynote. I mean by the end of the day, having read the paper, and then perhaps be in smaller group of people who are interested in that, spend the next two days on certain issue and write or read more.

Patrick: We do have community in London that is connected to many other communities, including our colleagues down the road. I would like to see as a site chair that we might bring other individuals to play a role and somewhat organizing a section.

* Liz: Again, something more intensive. It’s like the pre-conference. People who are interested become more extended. (We organize) Intensive things that can categorize on. This might go into Theocharis’s idea of a day, a chance for people to come for the day. So we have the somewhat core group, while we might have others that intersect. It might be helpful experimenting with.
* June: This raised the other thing. I know a lot of publications are generated here. What Liz said raised the issue that something has happened here can generate ongoing activities for the next two years. The other thing is that I think, we are all about education at the end of day. Another pre-conference can really be to be able to see some sort of work. There are many global things. The notion that we can expand on what has already been said, not dissing what is being said, to actually see what is going on. To go back to the publication’s idea. It would be perfectly possible to profit publication, if it was designed for the school teachers. Besides, school teachers do want to talk. They got precious little time to talk or to discuss these things. Universities are to link to schools. We could count on those things. It may not necessarily be a day, maybe an afternoon. That sort of thing would help us create community in some way.
* Eva G. H.: Going back to the previous point about promoting the conference. We did distribute information through seven networks and email list. If you have any suggestion, please send to the next chair. Most of these networks are in Europe, Canada and the U.S., because we only have these available.
* Patrick: It would be very helpful to share with me and the chair that will be elected here today about how to distribute the information. It’s important that as the call comes out, this community also help facilitate those things. We know and many of us that have been in this position also know that it is very demanding and requires a collective effort. It would be great if we can enact those.
* Estelle: One of the critical problems you mentioned is the difficulty of networks and different society, and conflict of schedule with other conferences. How may we coordinate to make sure everyone can attend to more conferences?
* Patrick: I think that’s a great point. I think that should be the very reason that within the next 6 months, we have the call ready and send it out, so that it’s viewed by a large community.
* Randall: It’s interesting to have these themes but it did occur to me that there is no discussion on race at this conference. Just a point of consideration for the Canadians.
* Liz: We did have a presentation on indigenous group and I did mention whiteness in my presentation. I see this as extremely fragmentation for our discipline in music education. We got to go to 3-4 conferences a year. It doesn’t make sense for the fact that instead of finding ways to collaborate with other groups, we are doing this intellectual tourism 2-3 times a year. This is one of the reasons that people find philosophy intimating, so people are not coming in or see themselves as a part of it.
* Lori-Anne D.: Maybe more collaboration, bring in different groups, have the four different groups and have them talk to each other. Maybe like what we did two weeks ago in Canada. There are four of them all meeting at the same time. It’s very fluid. Anybody can come.
* June: One of the problems is the number of the groups. You never know which one is going to pop up in the next few years. In the past, we had two conferences a year and that worked beautifully. Now we got so many conferences. You are absolutely right. And some are them are self-supporting and independent, and banging on their particular drum. And on another one, some want to collaborate. I think it’s a dilemma for our age.
* Patrick: As the chair, I would be glad to say that let’s not get into discussions of solving the problems of conferences in general. But I think the point brought here is the attempt to make connections to other societies and communities and see if there is possibility for intersection while not fully diluting the purpose of this conference. There is space for unique discourse. It is important to begin a dialogue and build relationship with other societies.

**Discussions about the 13th ISPME in 2021**

* Patrick: As you know, there has been prior formal invitations and informal conversations about the call for 2021. It’s not an easy task. We did have some positive interest. This is the time to have conversation to see if people in the room would like to propose a site to work toward and on behalf of the society.
* Øivind V.: Some people have mentioned Oslo. I have talked to people back home. There are possibilities to that.
* Patrick: Wonderful. We have Oslo as one of the suggestions for ISPME 2021.
* Leonard T.: Maybe Singapore.
* Patrick: Tell us more.
* Leonard: We are a small city in Asian. The immediate response is positive. Personally, I am passionate. But my main concern is that it may be too far.

Patrick: Wonderful. Thank you. Do we have any other possible suggestion?

* José L. A.: I checked with Granada in Spain. I tried to contact with them but didn’t succeed in this matter. But I will try.
* Patrick: This is exciting. We can have a conversation, if there isn’t any other fourth possibility.
* Estelle: My main concern is that sometime that we bring it back to the United States. Iris and I are even thinking that Cape Cod is a lovely place. We would happily prefer an American university.
* Patrick: We do have these four possibilities. Let’s first discuss what are the merits and what would be in the best interest of the society as we are to protect the society. We move from place to place and we have traditionally move between North America and Europe. There are obviously benefits to that. But we also need to consider other places that we have not been and how they may relate to the possible growth of the society. But obviously, cost and issues of going to those places are also things to consider. Let’s have a conversation first and then vote later.
* Liz: Two things I have. Is there a possibility connecting with any other? In other words, if we connect with, let’s say, ISSME, they already decided but maybe sociology hasn’t decided, then we decide. All I am saying is that we want to make connections more environmentally conscious and responsible. It seems to me that these two goals are somewhat in conflict. Maybe it’s about dedicating the idea of being able to make connections with another group.
* Patrick: I hear that. It could also be interpreted as a way to invite individuals and say that we have a space, would you join us? This will facilitate your process. A society like sociology that I know, because I am part of it, it has even a harder time finding a space. So that might not be an impediment.
* Estelle: Early on, we decide to move between North America and Europe. I love the idea of Granada. Both places are great. Liz, I also like the idea of being environmentally conscious.
* Patrick: Is there any other voice? I know people are passionate about that. It will be great if we have a larger conversation.
* June: Not for the next one. But I would be very interested in going to South Africa, if we are talking about the international dynamics of music education there. That would be in four years.
* Martin B.: I like the idea of Singapore. That could be a chance of more inclusive. For example, Singapore is closer for many of my colleagues. It’s possible that in 4 years span, there are more of my fellow colleagues to come to Singapore.
* Patrick: Thank you. Other comments?
* Austin W. S.: I would like to see this conference in the global south, as a way to hear more diverse voices.
* Lauren K.R.: If we would like to bring it back to the United States, I am happy to host it and honor Estelle, of course. Leonard, can you talk about the environment there?
* Leonard: It’s really hard to say. In different regions, people write in their language. In Singapore, English is the main language. Being in Asia, hopefully, we may attract diverse voices, like people from Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, China and other people from Asia.
* Warren C.: Can I just add something about diversity, maybe related to the suggestions? Wherever we will be, I would love that the amplification system to be available. I am hearing every other word and I imagine that if English is not their first language, it’s very important that we have clear diction, so people can read lips. I like the idea of multiple responses to papers. If I can hear the paper better and am not trying to guess what I am hearing, I can make better contribution. It will be important to think about the importance of language and communication for people from Asia, Africa since that’s where dialogue starts.
* Patrick: Other comments?
* June: I don’t want to discourage Norway. Because I love Norway. But I am thinking about the expense. Norway is very very very expensive. Singapore could be cheaper after you get there. I think we need to be aware of that.
* Hanne F.: I want to support what was just said. I think that there is an elephant in the room. English-speaking people that you are the majority and you are speaking here. And Also, that when you speak very fast without a microphone. . . I like that point. I would vote for clear English. Also, regarding terms in your area, sometimes it’s very difficult to understand. We are in different areas. Please don’t assume that we know them. They are difficult terms. Please clarify so that we can understand.
* Patrick: I appreciate that and we can bring some of the issues back on new business. But, let’s focus on the decision which we are to make right now. Let’s talk about the location.
* Øivind: First, I have little interest. It’s a lot of work. I was asked if there is possibility to host. I checked and there is possibility. June is right that it’s very expensive. So, I do not insist.
* Leonard: I am not insisting but I am personally passionate. I am not sure how the prices compare, but Singapore is not cheap, either.
* Patrick: I think we have two very good options. I would suggest that we move to pass the ballot around and elect one.
* June: I still would like to suggest that we know what would happen.
* Patrick: In the last meeting, we have decided that the business of the society will be carried on during the general assembly within all the members that are here and not post-factual. Being on the board, we got very uncomfortable making decisions on behalf of the society.
* Leonard: This is not for sure. I still need to clean the path with the institution. You know what I mean?
* Patrick: Yup. José (Aristegui), do you have a sense of certainty? We are to speak about that again then. If you have levels of certainty in all three, we can vote and select one knowing that we will have a second spot or third spot by the count. We need to be clear that if there is a certain level of certainty, that might change people’s mind. Can you tell us where you think you are, Leonard?
* Leonard: I will need to clear with the university. I think it’s positive, but I don’t know. I need to try it.
* Cathy: Do you foresee an issue?
* Leonard: I feel positive but I really don’t know. I will l try my best.
* José: they said yes, but no certain answer yet.
* Patrick: It seems that there is a higher level certainly there than Granada, Øivind?
* Øivind: I have talked to them about the possibility, and the institution is positive but of course we have to discuss about the time. It’s relatively high certainty.
* Lori-Anne: I suggest that we rank them.

First round:

* Patrick: We have to do this again. A tie between Singapore and Oslo between Singapore and Oslo. We did have Granada. We will vote again. Hopefully, this will resolve that. Please vote first and second choice as well.

Second round:

* Patrick: By 14 to 10 votes, Oslo will be the next site. Thank you, Leonard. We would love to consider that for subsequent meeting. Thank you, Øivind, for hosting us in 2021.

June: Can we make a suggestion that people who are interested in preparing for a formal proposal?

* Patrick: I think we are getting there. We asked for that. We are gradually getting there. We now need to address the election of the board. As you see, this is the current board. We have a chair, a site chair, a treasurer, an associate chair, program chair, recording secretary and communication. There are a couple things/places that are somewhat stable and they are connecting to the host of the subsequent conference. Therefore, there are a couple of items that are already in place. For the next conference, because the treasury is done in relation to the university, Cathy has agreed to work as a treasurer. Chiao-Wei has done a wonderful job recording and keeping our documents. She has agreed to serve once again. So is Ketil in the communication. Cecilia F. will continue to work on the pre-conference, which has been fantastic, at least for another term as we make this further and more robust. The associate chair is now basically being selected, which is the individual that follows into this path and being a part of the conversations. Øivind will become the facto associate chair in this process. Congratulations! So, we need to elect a chair and a program chair. The chair works with the site chair, helping facilitate communication, interact and make decisions about the conference. And program chair does the work that you all know, which was done by Joe Abramo this year. The program chair collects papers and sends out for reviews. This is very collective work. We all are part of the decision making, suggesting names and so forth. Yet, this person does very important work. We are glad to hear nomination from the floor for both the program chair and the chair. Any nomination?
* Lauren: I am volunteering for program chair.
* Patrick: Let’s put names here.
* June: I nominate Leonard to be the chair.
* Leonard: Thank you.
* Randall: I would like to nominate Alexandra for chair.
* Patrick: Any other nominations?
* Cathy: I spoke earlier with Hanne and she has said that she would be willing to stand for program chair.
* Patrick: Any other nominations?
* Lauren: I am happy to defer.
* June: Can’t this thing be joint?
* Patrick: It could. Indeed. Let’s look at the program chairs. We have a reclamation for a joint-position. Anybody?

All: Aye.

* Patrick: Any objection? [Silence] Okay. We will have co-chair.
* Cathy: Didn’t we have this last time?
* Patrick: Cecilia was kind of working with Joe. Yeah, absolutely. Are we interested in doing that as well for the chairs? Are you willing to and interested? The program has a lot of work, actually. The site chair normally does a lot of the local work, which is the heavy-duty work. The chair helps organize and supervise, if you will.
* Eva: If possible, I suggest that we have one chair. Sometimes, this person has to decide.
* Patrick: I tend to agree with Eva that we don’t need three people, myself and two other people. It might create more higher chance of having communication issues. Let’s vote on that position. Just one vote, either Leonard or Alexandra.

[After Patrick and Chiao-wei counted the votes]

* Patrick: So, the floor elected Alexandra as the next chair. Thank you, Alexandra. Thank you, Leonard, for standing for it. I’ll prepare the final list of the next board as we get ready to get out the minutes, the agenda and remaining information. Thank you for those who are willing to serve.

New business:

* Alexandra: I just want to remind you that please submit your paper to PMER as soon as possible, either with response or not. You will need to submit it through the website, whether it’s a book review or a full paper.
* Leonard: We would like to have book review from all over the world.
* Alexandra: We really would like to have international collections, not just specific area. That’s important. The book review should not just be summary but also critique. I have noticed that in the last reviews. Please continue to submit.
* Eva: I am wondering if you are on board or you are just one of the reviewers? Because I wonder if there is a discussion about the PMER, the review process.
* Alexander: We are also on the board. I don’t know exactly what goes online after it’s submitted. I have talk to Iris and Estelle and ask them about the process.
* Patrick: Maybe this is an appropriate point, given that the journal is historically connected to the conference. Maybe you (Alexandra) as a chair might bring the issue of expansion of the board. We have many people here that are participants, engaging with this but might not be serving on the board. This might help with the expedience of, if not publication process, at least the timeline for approval.
* Eva: Because assume that you got in your paper, it goes to months later. That’s not seemingly. If you can have conversation about this. . .
* Alexandra: I’ll try to figure it out.
* Eva: I appreciate that.
* June: I think it’s not very secret but a problem that people can support by a certain time. Maybe in the website we can put that in some collections, this review has to be done by a certain time. It doesn’t mean that we have to obey.
* Alexandra: I don’t know if there is a huge pool of people just wait there to do this.
* Panos: I think we have not discussed within the group. Possibility of creating book proposal This may be something that people would like to have in mind. I find it a good thing. To work from this, find various open ways to open.
* Randall: I would like to move to adjournment.
* Patrick: Another other new business?
* Liz: In the interest of environmental possibility, can we have either podcast…the idea is that people can participate something online in some way. In the digital world, maybe some place would be wonderful.
* Betty-Anne: Or streaming…
* Patrick: Yes. Absolutely. Any others? Hearing none. Do we have a motion to adjourn? Okay. Thank you very much, everyone.