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1)    Julie Hedges Brown called the meeting to order.

2)   Motion to accept the minutes of the 2012 meeting was made.

* + - * 1. Michael Harris made amendment regarding the fact that he is a doctoral student, not a masters student.  Correction was made.
        2. Minutes Passed unanimously.

3)   Old Business

* + 1. Julie Hedges Brown presented treasurer’s report (see Appendix 1)
    2. Michael Harris gave report of student representative meeting and AMS Council (see Appendix 2 for full report)
       - 1. Possibility of a graduate student retreat, mail list

Other means of creating more and better communication.

* + - * 1. Council discussed changing object and teaching statements of the AMS.

Pending official statement regarding teaching of music history at the collegiate level.

* + - * 1. Process of selecting contributions for colloquium. Nothing changed.
        2. Discussion about make-up of AMS board.
        3. Discussion took place about a voting student member on council.
    1. Report by representative to AMS Council (with Deborah Kaufmann substituting for Richard Agee (see attached report in Appendix 3)
       - * Julie Hedges Brown conveyed Deborah Kauffman’s comments regarding membership in regional chapter and membership in national organization.
    2. Richard Agee will remain faculty representative to AMS council (3 year term: 2012-2014).
       - * Next year, new representative must be elected next spring to begin term in 2015.
    3. Site of next year’s meeting will be ASU, probably with SMT and SEM.
    4. Election of student representative (2 year term)

Nominated: Garret Johnson and Melanie Shaffer

Garret Johnson elected (term: 2013-2014)

Kate Benessa will serve one more year (term: 2012-2013)

4)   New Business

* + - Carlo Caballero made motion to revise Section V. B. of the Chapter Bylaws regarding the selection of conference paper proposals:
* In accordance with the Ethical Guidelines of the A.M.S., all papers submitted for the meeting should be considered on a level playing field, and no privilege should be given to faculty over student papers. This principle suggests a method of anonymous review.
* Suggested revision to bylaws:
  + - * 1. Selection of Papers
* Papers by faculty, independent scholars, and students are evaluated in the same pool of abstracts, anonymously and without distinction of rank.
* The chapter membership shall elect a program committee consisting of three faculty members in good standing. The aim of the program committee is not to make the chapter meetings as competitive as the national meetings but rather to rank the papers on the basis of their merit, to manage the number of papers according to the time and space available on the host campus, and also to confer the status of peer review to papers given in our chapter meetings.

1. Amendment proposed regarding the program committee:
2. The program committee will 1) announce the call for papers, 2) conduct a blind review of the papers, 3) organize the accepted papers into paper sessions, 4) and communicate the results of the review with the authors and the host institution. The number of sessions in any given year (and therefore the number of papers accepted) shall be determined by the host institution. The program committee will forward the accepted paper abstracts to the host institution, which will create the abstract booklet for the conference.
3. The prescribed term for committee members will be 3 years, but in order ensure overlapping membership, for the first year three members will serve for one, two, and three years respectively.  Beginning in 2014, one committee member shall be elected each year at the annual business meeting.
4. Motion made and seconded (John Brobeck) for item I only.
5. Motion made and seconded for resolution regarding the 2014 meeting:

* Papers by faculty, independent scholars, and students are evaluated in the same pool of abstracts, anonymously and without distinction of rank.
* 1 opposed
* 1 abstain
* 20 approve

1. Motion made and seconded (Carlo Caballero) regarding program committee for 2014:

* The chapter membership shall elect a program committee for 2014 consisting of three faculty members in good standing. The aim of the program committee is not to make the chapter meetings as competitive as the national meetings but rather to rank the papers on the basis of their merit, to manage the number of papers according to the time and space available on the host campus, and also to confer the status of peer review to papers given in our chapter meetings.
* The program committee will 1) announce the call for papers, 2) conduct a blind review of the papers, 3) organize the accepted papers into paper sessions, 4) and communicate the results of the review with the authors and the host institution. The number of sessions in any given year (and therefore the number of papers accepted) shall be determined by the host institution. The program committee will forward the accepted paper abstracts to the host institution, which will create the abstract booklet for the conference.

1. Motion passed unanimously.
2. Nominated: John Brobeck, Betty Joe Basinger, Julie Hedges Brown.

* Slate passed unanimously

1. Deborah Crall made motion to form committee for examining the issue of paper selection as currently laid out in Section V.B of the Chapter Bylaws.
2. Nominated: Carlo Caballero, Jim Leve, John Brobeck, and Deborah Crall.
3. Motion and slate passed unanimously
4. Julie Hedges Brown made motion on behalf of Deborah Kauffman regarding conference funds remaining from 2012 meeting: to be divided between the 2012-2013 student reps to help offset expenses incurred from travel to the national meeting in Fall 2012.
5. Motion passed unanimously

5)    Meeting adjourned in haste so that members could return to the paper sessions.

APPENDIX 1

**AMS-RMC Final Financial Report**

RECEIPTS

Registration Fees collected:         $341.67

AMS per capita allotments:         $101.00

NAU School of Music donation:    $166.66

Total Funds:                 $609.33

MEETING EXPENSES:             $609.33

BALANCE REMAINING:        $0.00

APPENDIX 2

**AMS New Orleans 2012**

**Student Rep meeting**

**[Submitted by Student Representatives Michael Harris and Kate Benessa]**

Item 3A, Changing AMS Object - Concerns were expressed how teachers at small colleges, who spend most of the time teaching rather than publishing, likewise the question of how Independent Scholars, who do not teach, would fit in. Similar concerns were discussed at last year's meeting.

Item 3B, Statement on Teaching - Concerns were raised on the posture of such a statement, and what exactly is AMS trying to say when it "recommends" that all teachers of music history courses hold the PhD. Students, some of whom are already teaching at smaller schools, brought out stories of budget concerns at their schools where teachers have to perform multiple roles. Some worry that the move seems too defensive. Others offered ideas that we should do more outreach in ensuring history is taught well instead of saying that it should only be taught by us, focus more on the pedagogy.

There was a vote on this issue with only 3 students voting against it.

Item 4, Chapter Outreach - Students discussed ideas on how to encourage discussion between not only students in chapters, but also nationwide.

(Additionally, we have been discussing how we can connect with Music History students within the Rocky Mountain chapter.)

**AMS Council meeting**

Voting on Council Board Members, considering more direct elections by AMS body. -By-laws Object Statement, wording proposed at last meeting kept, going to a vote by society.  
-Introduction of Visiting Scholars at meeting

-Introduction of new JAMS editor, Anthony Sheppard from Williams College (first editor from a Liberal Arts school).  
-Old Business, Teaching Statement

-NASM would consider AMS stance on teaching credentials, but would decide for itself on how a PhD vs. DMA teaching history would impact accreditation, though impact could be negative even if school were not de-accredited.

-Again, there was much lively discussion on the topic on both sides and the letter was sent back to committee.  
-JAMS Colloquy, is it a good use of journal space? Questions were raised about the process of selecting topics and contributors.

-AMS Board, suggestions made on who makes up the board, also the question of allowing a student representative on the board who has a vote, also the possible including a voting representative from each Study Group  
-Chapters, what is their role in the society?