

Minutes of the Meeting of the Permanent Council of the ICPHS

Dates: 20 and 21 August 2011

Present on 20 August 2011: Ashby, Barry, Beckman, Chasaide, Cutler, Docherty, Esling, Fougeron, Granström, Maddieson, Morais, Nicolaidis, Nolan, Ohala, Pols, Recasens (chair), Roux, Sagisaka, Solé, Vaissière, Wells, Zee.

Present on 21 August 2011: Same as above. However, Vaissière is absent, Sagisaka is represented by proxy. Ohala joins the meeting at 13.40 (does not take part in the voting)

Minutes by: Vincent van Heuven (previous PC secretary)

1. Opening

Chair opens meeting. Lunch is being distributed.

2. Chairman's report 2007 - 2011

Chair summarizes the results of an e-mail questionnaire sent round among PC members in 2008 on the desired format of the next ICPHS. The vast majority of the PC members have indicated that 4-page full papers should be submitted, to be published in all available media (paper form, CD-ROM, website), that papers with poor English should be rejected, that reviewers of papers should have at least a PhD degree, and that explicit motivation for accept/reject is required on the part of reviewers. Reviewers may choose to remain anonymous. No agreement has been reached as to whether paper submissions should be anonymous.

After a discussion on the reviewing process, members voted in favour of a single blind procedure for the reviewing of papers, i.e. the authors' names are known to the reviewer but the reviewer remains anonymous.

An open call for bids was published on the IPA website. Potential bidders were contacted by the PC chair. Bids have been received from a consortium in (i) Paris, (ii) Stockholm and (iii) Scotland.

New IPA-elected members in the 2010 election for the PC are: Laver, Recasens, Fougeron, Beckman and Shockey. Ex officio members are Esling (President of the IPA) and Nicolaidis (Vice-President of the IPA). Nicolaidis' existing position on the PC was filled by Ashby. The chair of the next ICPHS will also be a member of the PC.

3. The next ICPhS

Procedural matters

Who should be allowed to vote when taking the decision on the next venue for the ICPhS? The meeting agrees unanimously that every (new) PC member will be allowed to vote. Members with a vested interest may discretionarily abstain from voting on a personal basis but are not under any obligation to do so.

Presentations and questions

The three bidders present their bids. After each presentation bidders answer questions asked by PC members.

The Paris presentation was made by Vaissière and Martine Adda-Decker. Points discussed were the lack of air conditioning in the university buildings, the fact that it remains unclear who signs the financial contracts, that there is full day off in the middle of the congress, and that the wooden chairs in the university theaters might be rather uncomfortable (would it be possible to supply cushions?).

The Stockholm bid was presented by Francisco Lacerda.

The Scottish bid was presented by Scobbie, seconded by Jane Stuart-Smith. Pols states that lecture rooms with fewer than 100 seats are too small. The size of the rooms can be adjusted by joining adjacent rooms to accommodate larger groups. There is accommodation for six parallel sessions with more than 200 seats. Maddieson asks what international airports serve Glasgow. Edinburgh, Glasgow and Prestwick are international airports. Pols asks about the financial responsibilities. The congress is set up as a company with limited liability, with legal status. To reduce costs, the Armadillo conference building will be rented for half a day (at 10,000 pound Sterling). All plenaries will be organized during one morning. If more than 1,000 delegates attend the conference a second half day in the Armadillo (at the end of the conference) is an option.

At this juncture the PC meeting is adjourned. It is agreed that a follow-up meeting will be organized the next day.

General discussion

It is agreed that the break-even point makes the critical difference between the possible venues. It is generally felt that 1,000 delegates for Paris would be unrealistic. Moreover, if the congress is to take place in August, accommodation will be expensive in Paris.

Roux would like to see stricter guidelines for bids and checklists (as used by ISCA). Financial guarantees are somewhat unclear. The university takes responsibility in the case of the Stockholm bid, for Paris it is undecided whether the responsibility resides with the university or with the city.

Chasaide points out that the IPA could give a start-up fund on condition that there are benefits for the membership.

Wells thinks that it is not a good idea to have the same city (i.e. Stockholm) organize the ICPhS twice within a fairly short period of time (20 years).

Ashby points out that there is a crucial difference between the bids in the amount of sponsorship.

Solé finds it worrying that the Paris bidders have not made up their mind about the location, and she fears that the Palais des Congrès is very, if not too, expensive. Fougeron states that the Paris organization prefers the university location even if there is no air conditioning.

Chasaide argues that (student) groups should be kept together. In Glasgow and Stockholm student accommodation is compact and at walking distance from the conference site.

Cutler believes in the attraction of a major city. Paris would be much more appealing to American and Asian delegates than Glasgow or Stockholm.

Nicolaidis maintains that financial and historical criteria (whether a particular location has hosted the event and how long ago) are important. Stockholm has hosted the Congress relatively recently. She prefers Glasgow to Paris as the former has never hosted ICPhS and is clearly less expensive. She suggests that there should be a recommendation to the Scottish consortium for more plenaries.

Decision

A preliminary voting was held to decide which of the two possible venues in Paris would be preferred:

Paris Descartes (university buildings):	12
Paris Palais des Congrès (conference centre)	3
Abstain :	1

Next the PC members took a vote on the preferred city/country for the next ICPhS. The votes were counted as follows

Paris Descartes:	3
Stockholm:	2
Glasgow:	12
Abstain	1

The Scottish consortium will organise the 18th ICPhS. The decision will be made public during the closing session.

4. Congress chair's report

Zee briefly reported that for the 17th ICPHS 579 papers were accepted and 119 (18%) were rejected. A total of 711 delegates and 49 guests registered for the conference. One laptop has been reported missing from the e-mail room, and one person was escorted off the premises (could not produce a badge but said his wife was presenting a paper).

5. Elections of President, Vice-President and Secretary

Following the principle adopted in 2007 that the VP of the IPA is automatically appointed as the president of the PC, it was proposed that Katerina Nicolaidis, VP of the IPA, be the President of the PC for the period 2011-2015. As this principle is not stipulated in the Statutes, Nicolaidis asked for a vote of confidence, which was provided by the PC members. Eric Zee, organizer of ICPHS 2011, was proposed for VP and Maria Josep Solé for Secretary. The positions were decided on by a show of hands.