We had a high number of submissions this year: 156 proposals.

I’d like to thank the very dedicated members of the program committee for their hard work. Each member of the committee reviewed 16 full-length paper submissions and 7-9 alternative session submissions.

This is far more than the 10-12 papers I’d promised when I asked each of them to serve on the program committee. Amazingly, nobody complained about the additional labor, and we even managed to persuade Seamus Mulryan to join the committee at the 11th hour, which helped a great deal.

Each paper proposal was reviewed by 3 reviewers, and alternative sessions were reviewed by 2 reviewers.

Program Committee

Charles Bingham, Simon Fraser University
Deron Boyles, Georgia State University
Josh Corngold, University of Tulsa
John Covaleskie, University of Oklahoma
Paul Farber, Western Michigan University
Heather Greenhalgh-Spencer, Texas Tech University
Kathryn Hytten, University of North Carolina - Greensboro
Kanako Ide, Soka University
Megan Laverty, Teachers College Columbia University
Stephanie Mackler, Ursinus College
Dini Metro-Roland, Western Michigan University
Avi Mintz, University of Tulsa
Seamus Mulryan, Ursinus College
Suzanne Rosenblith, Clemson University
Judith Suissa, University College London Institute of Education
Ashley Taylor, Colgate University
Quentin Wheeler-Bell, Kent State University
Terri Wilson, University of Colorado
Guoping Zhao, Oklahoma State University

Special thanks to Ryan Ozar, Kent State University, for graduate assistance, and to Eduardo Duarte for helping us set up and navigate our googledrive. Thanks also to the careful record keeping of Cris Mayo (2013 Program Chair) and Michele Moses (2014 Program Chair). This gave us many useful templates to draw on.

Thanks also to Mark Kretovics, Dean of the College of Education, Health and Human Services, Kent State University for covering the costs of printing the program and for funding a 50% GA ship. Barbara Applebaum sent him a letter of thanks.

And thanks to Paul O’Keeffe for designing the program booklet for the society pro bono.

We received 105 paper submissions and 40 proposals for alternative sessions, of which 25 were panels based on a topic, 11 were book panels, and 14 work-in-progress (WIP) sessions. We had originally thought we would offer the WIP option to folks whose papers were not accepted, but the program became too packed and so we only considered actual WIP submissions for consideration. We accepted 8 WIP papers. Visa problems for one accepted WIP proposal led us to reduce this number to the 7 listed on the program.

We accepted 34 paper submissions, which is 2 more than in the past. This was in consultation with Chris Higgins, who urged us to be judicious about raising the number of accepted papers since it adds to the
workload of the managing editor of the yearbook. It also reduces the rejection rate, so there were “impact factors” to consider….

We increased the number of consecutive sessions from 5 to 6. This enabled us to increase representation on the program to 181 participants (rough estimate, includes chairs, each person counted once), and we think it also might have contributed to a solid registration rate (197 registered participants so far). What this does to the quality of the conference is a consideration, since the possibility of a more fragmented experience is high. On the other hand, it must be noted that many institutions have new restrictions on conference travel, limiting funding to presenters only (i.e. chairing sessions and simply attending a conference no longer qualifies for travel funds).

The official call for papers did not set limits on the number of paper submissions, although only 2 people made multiple submissions. This is something to make clear in future, especially if the CFP goes to different websites and draws people not familiar with our traditions. Perhaps more problematic, the CFP did not limit the number of appearances in alternate sessions. This is something for future program committees to consider. We kept to the tradition of not inviting respondents whose papers had been accepted in the interest of diversifying the program.

At the urging of some members of the program committee, I made a concerted effort to have proportional representation by gender in the selection of papers. So far as we could tell, about 1/3 of paper submissions were written by women, and slightly less than 1/3 of papers on the program are by women (10 out of 32).

We had about 6 requests for technology (mostly projectors) prior to the conference. We made it clear that charges had to be passed on to individuals, and all declined. A good many more requests were made on sight. There is a growing expectation that technology will be available. We’ll have to consider this in future when negotiating with hotels.

Last, but not least, I want to thank Barbara Applebaum for giving me this opportunity to serve the society in this way. I have been amazed at the generosity and support of my colleagues in the society, and especially the support of colleagues on the executive board, not only in terms of time, but also conceptually. Chris Higgins helped enormously in the re-crafting of my initial draft of the call for papers. Josh Corngold helped keep me to a time-line in his characteristically gentle but determined way, and Jessica Hochman was a huge help publicizing the program with the membership at various points along the way. Thanks also to Katherine Jo and Joyce Atkinson for their help with the OJS system, and I look forward to working with Naomi Hodgson in her new capacity as managing editor of the yearbook.