



EXECUTIVE MINUTES

Meeting	Executive board/Research Steering Committee	
Date	Wednesday 26 November 2014	
Time	9.30am – 1.00pm AEST	
Location	RMIT, Building 13, Level 3, Room 11 (enter via cnr Russell and Victoria Streets)	
Agenda item	Comments	Actions
1. Attendance and Apologies	Present: Craig Batty, Leo Berkeley, John Cumming, James Verdon, Tim Thomas, Bettina Frankham Apologies: Nick Oughton, Sean Maher, Gillian Leahy, Alison Wotherspoon	
Previous Minutes	Not raised	
2. Establishment of Research Sub-Committee		
	<i>Need to recognise difference between this group and the existing research steering committee. The new group with invited</i>	

Agenda item	Comments	Actions
	<p>professors is to be called the Research Advisory Panel.</p> <p>Professors confirmed for membership – Stuart Cunningham, Hart Cohen, Kathryn Millard, Douglas Kahn (in place of Ross Harley).</p> <p>Professors approached but not yet confirmed – Ross Gibson, Sue Baker, Julian Knowles.</p>	
<p>2.1. Membership (of RAP)</p>	<p>Discussion re possible additional members</p> <p>The new group should be constituted as an advisory panel.</p> <p>The Research Committee comes up with questions that they can ask the Research Advisory Panel</p>	<p>Motion: that Tim approach Tim Cahill to be part of the RAP</p> <p>Moved: John Cumming</p> <p>Seconded: Craig Batty</p> <p>Carried</p> <p>Motion: that Leo be ASPERA rep on the RAP</p> <p>Moved: John Cumming</p> <p>Seconded: Tim Thomas</p> <p>Carried</p> <p>Bettina Frankham At the next AGM put an item on the agenda that we are seeking membership of the Research Committee.</p> <p>Leo Berkeley to have conversations with Research Advisory Panel around the issues that have emerged from the Sightlines process</p>
<p>2.2. Expectations of RAP</p>	<p>The Research Advisory Panel would be an advisory committee that will meet once or twice a year to give advice on a range of research issues, e.g. research grants</p> <p>Recognition that Creative Writing as a discipline have already done a lot of this T Research Advisory Panel can offer good</p>	<p>The Research Committee will look closely at the Sightlines outcomes with a view to adopting the framework as model for a future journal</p> <p>Tim Thomas proposed that given the interest in the room, members of the ASPERA executive, Gillian Leahy, Leo Berkeley, and Susan</p>

Agenda item	Comments	Actions
	<p>advice about what ASPERA should be doing in this space</p> <p>Clarification that the Research Committee is a sub-committee of the executive and a separate thing to the Research Advisory Panel</p>	<p>Kerrigan to be appointed as members of the Research Committee</p> <p>Tim Thomas to contact Sean Maher to forward communication with the Research Advisory Panel invited potential members.</p> <p>Leo Berkeley to liaise with the Research Advisory Panel regarding the peer review process developed for Sightlines.</p>
<p>2.3. Five Year Plan</p>	<p>Developing guidelines for reviewers</p> <p>Observing RMIT's Sightlines project</p> <p>Asking about how a process of refereeing without publication could work</p> <p>Getting the correspondence from Sean Maher with potential members of the Research Advisory Panel</p> <p>Defining what the Research Advisory Panel means?</p>	<p>Craig Batty as convenor of the RAP to include Susan Kerrigan and Gillian Leahy as members.</p> <p>Leo Berkeley to report back to ASPERA Executive on how the peer review process goes with Sightlines</p>
<p>3. ASPERA Conference 2015</p>		
<p>3.1. Theme</p>	<p>Theme- What's this Space?</p>	
<p>3.2. Timeline for Conference Proceedings</p>	<p>Agreement to request the papers in full for peer review before the conference and to have two streams: peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed.</p> <p>the call for papers needs to go out before Christmas</p>	<p>Alison Wotherspoon to action that that the call for papers goes out before Christmas</p> <p>Moved: James Verdon</p> <p>Seconded: Tim Thomas</p> <p>Craig Batty to write a draft of the CFP</p>

Agenda item	Comments	Actions
		<p>Craig Batty to discuss with Alison Wotherspoon what support she needs to manage the peer review process for the conference proceedings</p> <p>Moved: Tim Thomas</p> <p>Seconded: James Verdon</p>
<p>3.3. Other Conference business</p>	<p>Discussion around length of sessions and how many per hour. Defer to some degree to conference convenor</p>	<p>Tim Thomas to talk to Alison Wotherspoon about the duration of sessions at the conference.</p> <p>Moved: John Cumming</p> <p>Seconded: James Verdon</p>
<p>4. Longer Term plans for Conference proceedings</p>	<p>Craig batty and Susan Kerrigan report (as attached in Appendix 1) was discussed.</p>	<p>Bettina - a version (précis) of Craig's and Susan's report be made available to ASPERA members via Google group</p> <p>Moved: Tim Thomas</p> <p>Seconded: John Cumming</p>
<p>4.1. Develop proceedings into a book</p>	<p>Discussion regarding this process has occurred via previous emails. The plan is to take this into next year and see what will eventuate. Publishing proceedings is useful in terms of providing opportunities to HDRs for publication. Proceedings from last two conferences have been peer reviewed.</p> <p>Three articles from last ASPERA conference are already published via 'Studies in Australasian Cinema' journal.</p> <p>"Pursuing extreme romance: change and continuity in the creative screen industries in the Hunter Valley" by Phillip McIntyre</p>	<p>Craig Batty to monitor and feed back development to the ASPERA Executive</p>

Agenda item	Comments	Actions
	<p>and Susan Kerrigan</p> <p>“A promise of change: 52 Tuesdays (2013) – a case study of collaborative, low-budget feature filmmaking practice” by Kath Dooley</p> <p>“Sounding out an education: different pathways, one industry?” by Natalie Lewandowski</p>	
<p>4.2. Potential for an ASPERA journal</p>	<p>Could focus on the research outputs that come from the film production process. It would be a journal for creative practitioners working within the academy. The approach would be one of “you’ve done the project now tell us about what around it is research”.</p>	
<p>4.3. Weigh up advantages of journal vs conference proceedings</p>	<p>Not addressed</p>	
<p>5. Developing resources for grant applications</p>	<p>Not addressed</p>	
<p>6. Getting input from government funding bodies to the Research Sub-Committee</p>	<p>Not addressed</p>	

Agenda item	Comments	Actions
7. 2016 ASPERA conference (ATOM Screen Futures partnership proposal)	Need to take this to the AGM.	Defer discussion and come back to it post 2015 AGM
8. General Business		
8.1. Balance of accounts and projected immediate outgoings		Motion: that we accept the accounts Moved: Tim Thomas Seconded: John Cumming
8.2. Money to help Sightlines convenors to follow up on peer review process		Motion: that money be contributed from ASPERA to Sightlines to pay for a RA to follow up all the peer reviewers and ensure that deadlines Moved: Tim Thomas Seconded: John Cumming
	Meeting closed at 1:20pm	

Appendix 1

ASPERA Research Committee Report 25th November 2014

Re: Conference Proceedings and Journal Publications

Susan Kerrigan and Craig Batty.

Journal Publication Outcomes from ASPERA 2014 Conference

3 Journal Publication outcomes have resulted from the ASPERA 2014 conference “Screen Explosion” with *Studies in Australasian Cinema*, who publishes with Taylor and Francis.

Phillip McIntyre & Susan Kerrigan (2014): Pursuing extreme romance: change and continuity in the creative screen industries in the Hunter Valley, *Studies in Australasian Cinema*, DOI: [10.1080/17503175.2014.960680](https://doi.org/10.1080/17503175.2014.960680)

Natalie Lewandowski (2014): Sounding out an education: different pathways, one industry?, *Studies in Australasian Cinema*, DOI: [10.1080/17503175.2014.976447](https://doi.org/10.1080/17503175.2014.976447)

Kath Dooley (2014): A promise of change: 52 Tuesdays (2013) – a case study of collaborative, low-budget feature-filmmaking practice, *Studies in Australasian Cinema*, DOI: [10.1080/17503175.2014.976446](https://doi.org/10.1080/17503175.2014.976446)

ASPERA Conference Proceedings

6 Articles were blind-peer reviewed and **5 have been revised for publication**. One article was rejected by the peer-reviewers.

These 5 articles are now with the Copy Editor, arranged by Craig and are being prepared for online delivery. The ERA compliant website is also being prepared to take these articles and hopefully **they will be published before the end of 2014**.

Feedback about Peer-review processes for Conference Proceedings – The Peer-reviewers all submitted their responses within the timeframe. There were inconsistencies with the peer-reviewing, mostly the inexperienced reviewers were too harsh with their assessment of the articles. Thankfully we had allotted 3 reviewers to each article and we distributed them so each author had two experienced and one inexperienced reviewer. We did this to help build peer-review skills within ASPERA and to show that we are committed to the training both scholars, authors and peer-reviewers within the Screen Production.

Author’s feedback on Peer-review – we found that ASPERA scholars need more experience working through reviewer feedback, some of the author’s really didn’t understand how to use the feedback to improve the clarity of their arguments. If ASPERA wants to improve publication output then it is important to spend time discussing the benefits of blind peer-reviewing and how to use reviewers feedback to clarify assumptions and improve academic arguments.

ASPERA Special Issues x 2 with *Studies in Australasian Cinema* (SiAC).

ASPERA has been assigned 9.3 (end of 2015) and 10.1 (beginning of 2016) editions. We have **12 paper’s** that are ready to go forth for blind-peer review, one paper has been sent back to the author to be improved as it did not meet the journals quality and it would have been a waste of time emailing it to a peer-reviewer for their feedback.

We are waiting on Anthony Lambert, Editor of SiAC to grant us access to their online reviewing system so that we can begin the blind-peer review process.

2013 Conference Presentations - John Hookham assisted in collecting the **6** presentations written up as Journal articles. John Hookham has also provided a preliminary peer-review of all these papers and gave us a list of possible reviewers.

There were 4 authors who for various reasons were unable to meet the deadline or withdrew their submissions because they found through their literature searches others had already written up similar ideas, other excuse was lack of time to think through ideas and write up work.

2014 Conference Presentation - Susan Kerrigan collected **6** presentations written up as Journal articles. There were 5 authors who withdrew their submissions for the same reasons described above.

We are anticipating that some of the 12 paper's may not make it through the blind peer-review process and we will manage that as the feedback comes in. This may mean that we may be able to consider papers from the 2015 ASPERA conference.

Susan Kerrigan and Craig Batty.