

July 23, 2012

Report to the Board re: 2012 Program Committee

From: Heather M. Dalmage on behalf of Program Co-Chairs Heather M. Dalmage and Tanya Saunders

We appreciate the opportunity to serve as Co-Chairs of the Program Committee for the 2012 Annual Meeting and appreciate being able to work with President Wendy Simonds' creative vision for The Art of Activism theme of the conference. And, thanks to Michele Koontz for mentoring us throughout the year. Michele walked us through every detail and made sure we kept to deadlines. Since joining SSSP for the first time in the mid-90s, I have marveled at Michele's skill in managing the annual meeting, and now after a year as a Program Committee Co-chair, my respect has grown even more. As always, Michele made the committee work manageable and successful.

In addition, we'd like to extend thanks for the contributions of our Program Committee members: Nancy Michaels, Michael T. Maly, Chavella T. Pittman and Ashley M. Currier. The Program Committee sponsored 146 sessions, and introduced the Critical Dialogue as a creative format for presenting and engaging scholarship and activism.

### Paper Submissions

As of February 2, 2012, 522 papers had been submitted, 485 of the papers were submitted by the January 31, 2012 deadline. We were able to accept all but one paper (lacked methods and theoretical frame). With the addition of invited papers and student award winners we currently have 529 papers in various sessions including, workshops, critical dialogue, film series, and author-meets-critics.

Table of paper acceptance 2011 and 2012

|   | 2011 | 2012   |
|---|------|--|
| Accepted by 1 <sup>st</sup> choice  | 252  | 255  |
| Accepted by 2 <sup>nd</sup> choice  | 39   | 42   |
| Repository papers<br>(includes Papers added by<br>organizers and Papers<br>moved to sessions) | 240  | 232<br>(Repository papers-109,<br>Papers added by<br>organizers-77 and Papers<br>moved to sessions-46) |

As in 2011, the Program Committee created 9 sessions, including one critical dialogue, from repository papers: Body Rights and Human Rights; Cultural Perspectives/Cultural Change; Social Mobility; Education and Structural Inequality; Gender; Immigration; Social Movements/Community Organizing; Social Capital - Critical Dialogues; Students, Pedagogy and the Education System.

As of July 23, 2012, we have 145 sessions in place (1 session was cancelled: *THEMATIC Session 16: Use of Art for Advocacy and Social Welfare*).

Each division was allowed to propose up to 3 regular sessions and up to 7 co-sponsored sessions. We encouraged each division to include a papers-in-the-round session and offered a new format: Critical Dialogue, as a part of the 10 total allowable sessions. We currently have one Critical Dialogue session created by the Program Committee as well as, two roundtable sessions and one papers-in-the-round session created by division chairs.

Recommendation: The 2012 Program Committee recommends that Division chairs are given information about the Critical Dialogue format. This particular format both accommodates more papers (eight papers) and allows for rigorous academic exchange of ideas through dialogue rather than the traditional Q&A format.

#### Sponsoring Sessions with Other Organizations

Of the 145 sessions, three are co-sponsored with outside organizations (ASA, SWS and ABS).

#### Innovative Programming

1. In 2012, SSSP offered the Critical Dialogue format. This format allows for 8 papers and a facilitator. Each presenter is given five minutes. Following the papers, presenters and the audience will participate in a dialogue build around the consistent and contradictory themes raised in the brief presentations.

Recommendations: We recommend growing the number of Critical Dialogue sessions in 2013 by making Division chairs aware of the possibilities for a greater exchange of ideas and inclusion of more papers.

2. We found a wonderful way to create spaces for graduate students to serve in SSSP: As presiders of the film sessions. In 2012, Program Committee member, Nancy Michaels, created a film series and then organized graduate students to preside. The response and enthusiasm from the students was overwhelming and wonderful.

Recommendation: Increase student involvement and participation by creating space for grad students to preside in the film sessions.

#### Exemptions offered

We granted 29 registration waivers for the 2012 conference. The criteria for exemption include: (A) Non-students who are unemployed and/or receiving monthly financial assistance to meet living expenses may request a waiver of registration fees to participate on the program. (B) Individuals from community, labor, and comparable organizations working on social problems or social justice

issues who have been invited to serve on a panel or to make a presentation. (C) Non U.S. and non-Canadian scholars who are from less advantaged countries. (D) Co-authors of papers who will not be attending the meeting. One of the co-authors must be present.

The number of exemptions is up from 17 in 2011 and up from 12 in 2010.

Recommendation: The Board should review the exemption criteria and decide if a cap is needed and/or other criteria.

### Editing of the final program

Michele sent the penultimate draft to the Program Committee, the Local Arrangements Chair, Héctor Delgado, her staff and the president. It became clear in the context of the editing process, that it would be helpful to have clear(er) directions. Traditionally, the Program Committee and others have not changed the paper title the authors listed. However, this year we found myriad instances in which the paper titles were inconsistent regarding capitalization. Authors may have a variety of ways of expressing their creativity in titling, but collectively, the inconsistencies make for a sloppy program. Authors are given two opportunities to review and edit their titles, but many do not do so (or choose not to).

Recommendation:

The Board should create a common format for paper titles – perhaps following the rules of the Social Problems' journal. The Board should also create criteria for the editing process. Specifically addressing how much editing the Program Committee can do of paper titles: capitalizing, punctuation, adding prepositions etc. And, the Board should discuss creating a statement to the membership that (if the board so chooses) the Program Committee will edit for fluidity and consistency unless they are given explicit instructions from the author to not edit.