**APME Board Meeting Minutes**

**December 18, 2016   
5:00 PM via Google Chat**

**Board Members Participating:** D. Fish, D. Hanley, I. Kornfeld, J. Knight, W. Pettit, J. Pignato (note taker), B. Powell, K. Reinhert, C. Wittstruck.

**Meeting called to order:** 5:11 PM

1. **Conference Submissions:** D. Harley, excited about 100+submissions.
   1. B. Powell kudos to Board for recirculating call.
   2. Submissions do not include Board Keynote Panels discussed at Sept. meeting.
   3. List of presenters disassociated from abstracts to keep review process blind.
   4. D. Hanley, should Board proceed reviewing submissions or should it be done by Conference Committee or ad hoc committee.
      1. D. Hanley, do we want to prevent single presenters from presenting multiple times. C. Wittstruck expressed that there was some frustration with that last year.
      2. K. Reinhert suggested color coding submissions to identify multiples from the same presenter.
      3. B. Powell, Committee (or Board) could make decisions to limit specific submissions.
      4. B. Powell, 9 performance submissions, anticipating 10 total. We should avoid programming at the end of the last day.
      5. B. Powell, nature of presentation also impacts scheduling, e.g., whether it’s a workshop or a presentations. Based on past experience, suggested reviewing them for quality first and then thinking about scheduling second.
      6. J. Pignato smaller groups would be more efficient and could reserve right to limit the numbers of presentations accepted by any one participant based on things like thematic or other programming considerations.
      7. J. Knight, maybe have different groups consider different types of presentations, e.g., workshops, research presentations, practical presentations. performances, etc.
      8. D. Hanley, once the review process is done, there should be process for considering overall conference, e.g., do we want to continue with strands, etc.
      9. Discussion ensued about the idea of having dedicated spaces/rooms for each type of presentation, e.g., a day of Pop 15s, or a day of workshops. Could make selling sponsorship for these approaches. J. Pignato recommended that the blocks of time should be uniform so that participants can pick and choose from each of the presentation types rather than locking into one schedule or the other.
      10. J. Knight, performances should be scheduled by type, e.g., those appropriate for morning as opposed to “hard core” for evening.
      11. D. Hanley, important to make sure CU Denver is represented in the conference programming.
      12. K. Reinhert, we could do it with four committees (organized by presentation type), the performances could be reviewed by the entire Board since there’s only 9 or 10 submissions.
      13. B. Powell volunteered to put together “mini review” committees based on Board Members interests. Would like to have this together before the holidays and have decisions made by mid January.
      14. D. Hanley, must provide them with a clinician/presenter agreement that confirms their participation during the conference without committing to specific days.
      15. D. Hanley, Conference Committee will handle review. Individual Board Members can volunteer to be involved in specific areas of interests (e.g., Pop 15, research, workshops, panels, performances, etc.). Board Members must commit by 12/21.
2. **Key Notes and Board Led Panels:**
   1. W. Petit,Draft invitation to ?love ready to go. Management is expecting an inquiry regarding his availability, honorarium, etc.
   2. B. Powell,Michael League Snarky Puppy, interested in presenting on music education and what it’s it meant to his life. Positive pending availability.
   3. J. Pignato, DJ M A N I K is available and eager to come. Pignato asked about a mechanism to pay for flights and accommodations for keynotes speakers.
      1. I. Kornfeld,rule of thumb speaker that generates substantial attendees, it makes sense to bring them in, otherwise, everyone has to see it as a community event.
         1. J. Knight,agreed with above.
      2. D. Hanley,would M A N I K come without flight/accommodations
         1. J. Pignato agreed to speak with him about coming to do a gig (i.e., promoter pays to get him to Denver), or asking about potential that Pioneer might sponsor his travel. Not sure he would come without some support.
3. **Next meeting:** Potential for January 20, 8:00 PM East (5:00 PM Pacific) to coincide with NAMM APME meeting.
4. **Meeting Adjourned:** 6:00 PM