We have agreed to build internal cohesion by initiating meetings with a check-in time, keeping ourselves aware, become a friendship group, share workload, help each other in need, be open about problems, involve ourselves in email chats and feedback, and once a year set goals individually and collectively for the journal. Suggest brief comments especially relevant to the group and the journal. Especially report on visits to Latin America.

Annual Meeting 2016  Noon to 1:15 p.m.
1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of April 10, 2016 minutes (George)
3. Approval of LASA minutes May, 2015 (Rosalind)
4. Resolutions:
   Election of Board Members
   Resolved that the current active Coordinating Editors be elected directors of the board of Latin American Perspectives

   Election of Officers
   Resolved that the following directors be elected officers of the board of Latin American Perspective:
   President: Ron Chilcote
   Vice Presidents: Rosalind Bresnahan and George Leddy
   Secretary: Marjorie Bray
   Treasurer: Fran Chilcote

5. Annual Reports to be received and approved:
   Outreach: Website (Aiskell )
   Social Media, Blogs & Podcasts (Rochelle Bernet and Tomás Ocampo)
   Journal Ads and Exchanges (Tomás)
   Book Reviews (Stephanie Moore and Joseph Mejia)
   Archive (Joseph)
   LASA and Conferences (Rosalind)
   Future Issues (Rosalind and George)
   Film Review (Kristy and Tomas)
   Translation Report (Rosalind and George)

6. Ratifications (Approve unless item for discussion)
Lunch and Social 1:15 to 2 p.m.

Retreat 2 to 5:30 p.m.

Topics for Retreat
1) Chilcote ten Observations on Latin America (Discuss and Debate—passed out at April 10 meeting)
2) Ideas for expanding social media
3) Outreach for CLACSO
4) Turnaround and Rejected Manuscript report
5) Editor performance evaluations (Associate and Participating)

Other Matters

Next Meetings:
Sunday May 22: Home: Rhonda; Chair: Bill Minutes: Kristi

Publication Schedule:
For 2016: Ecuador (Jan); Brazil and State (Mar); Religion and Politics (May), Climate Change + LASA Journal Panel (July); Memory II (Sept); Memory III + Open (Nov)
For 2017: Chávez (Jan); Urban II (Mar); Earthquake+Open May; Stavenhagen I (July); Slavery +Open (Sept); Open (Nov)
For 2018: Stavenhagen II (January); Media (March); Neo-Extractivism (May); Democracy and Human Rights (July)

Current Issues (Review with Flow Charts as Relevant. Written report twice each year and Written and Oral presentation as Political Education six months prior to publication).

*Slavery (Daniela Issa) Need Intro. Combine with open material. Need Intro

Media (Crowder and Campo)
Neo-Extractivism (Fabricant)
Post-Conflict Peru (Burt)
Neoliberalism and Higher Education (Beserra, Austin, and Lavergne)
Democracy and Human Rights (Aviles and Celis)
Neoliberalism in Central America (Pine and Geglia)
Informal Economic Revisited (Tamar Wilson and Ray Bromley)
Jewish/Palestine Issue in Latin America (Munck and Pozzi)
Puerto Rico (Armando and Jean)

*Priority for publication and scheduled. Copy to Barbara, some being set on line.
Future Issue Possibilities:
Music and Social Movements (Jonathan)
Latin America and Surveillance viewed through Wikileaks (Kevin Young)
Neoliberalism and Alternatives (Mayo)

Nominations

LAP Meeting Schedule 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 17 2016</td>
<td>Jean Ward</td>
<td>Rosalind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Rosalind</td>
<td>Rhonda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24 Retreat</td>
<td>Rosalind</td>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22</td>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Kristi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 9</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Kristi</td>
<td>Dolores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 4</td>
<td>Kristi</td>
<td>Dolores</td>
<td>Jean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget for January; Annual Meeting for April;
LASA New York City May 27-30, 2016

Collective policies:

Scheduled meetings are six per year including retreat, usually during the April annual meeting or at a different time. Possible emergency meetings during September, December, March, June as needed. (See schedule)

Collective members are expected to attend all official meetings. Excused absences (attending a conference or illness, for example) are justified by an email report to the office 72 hours prior to the meeting with input on decisions (manuscripts, prospectuses, and so on). The report will be circulated to the collective as a means of communication and should also serve to inform the meeting host. Members are expected to attend a majority of meetings minimally and less than that should revert to leave of absences and removal of name from the masthead, but continue to receive collective materials and be reinstated when available. Inactive members will continue to receive distribution of materials sent to the collective. Occasionally manuscripts may be sent to inactive collective members for review.

Issue Editors and Coordinating Editors responsible for manuscripts may write an evaluation at any time but should be prepared to coordinate reviews for decision at journal meetings. Outside Issue Editors may submit reports regarding the status of their issues.

Manuscripts: Any editor may request to review a manuscript. In cases where decisions may not be reached, the manuscript may be placed on the editors secured location on the web site and read by all members. Evaluations are normally signed, but may be unsigned at the discretion of the editor. The collective may also edit an evaluation where appropriate.
Book Reviews: Henceforth all book reviews will be sent (electronically) to all collective members but will be evaluated by a coordinating committee including book review editors. The Book Review Editor(s) must evaluate and at least one other collective member should evaluate the book review, and all collective members will read book reviews and participate in decisions.

Flow Charts: Monthly to Issue Editors and Editors Section on the LAP web site. Distributed to collective in October, January, and May: Office preparation and distribution to collective and to issue editors.

Issue Reports: Every six months editors should present written reports covering manuscripts for their issues.

Political Education: Issue Editor of a prospectus-originated issue presents written and oral report at least six months prior to publication. Current issues debated. PE Coordinator schedules and identifies background material.

Task Lists or Decision Flows from Meeting: Prepared by Managing Editor following a meeting for office staff, but will be placed on the editors secured location on the web site.

Office Report to Collective: Prepared by Managing Editor. Written summary with items for decision.

Office Update Reports to all editors on list serve several times a year. Office Political Reports to collective as screened by Managing Editor from feedback from editors and others.

Office Assessment of manuscript evaluations. Letter grades are related to check boxes in the manuscript evaluation form and are used to facilitate summary reports in the journal data base (editorial work load and performance). Each editor evaluation is graded 5 (high) to 1 (low) and associated with value statements approved by the collective which relate to promptness and quality of review. Author names are known to the collective and blinded to other editors. Normally each manuscript is reviewed by two inside editors (Coordinating and Associate) and two outside Participating Editors (including one Latin American).

Policy on Translations: Translation to English – Consistent with our mission to bring the work of Latin American scholars to the English-speaking world, LAP covers cost of translations and will:

1. Translate manuscripts accepted in another language. If the author does not have near-native fluency in English, we prefer manuscript submission in the author’s first language. For review, we may request resubmission in foreign language of manuscripts submitted in English if the material is poorly translated.

2. Consider for publication significant material already published in a foreign language to ensure that it is widely available to English language readership, usually with some revision and updating.

Making LAP content available in Portuguese and Spanish: As scholars outside Latin America who research within the region, we must strive to make our work known in the language and the place where its research data and interviews were initiated or based. Therefore, LAP will:

1. Post on the LAP website and, if appropriate, on its social media, the final edited foreign language version of any manuscript translated to English and published in the journal.

2. Encourage, indeed seek, translation and publication in Portuguese or Spanish language books or journals of material originally published in LAP.

Task Areas: Each collective member should identify and be responsible for one task and inform collective by email report as needed but present one brief report at the annual meeting (April).

Future Issues and New Directions: How can LAP be unique and an alternative to the mainstream? How can the journal content be made more accessible for classroom and study groups? What issues and reports can be included in future issues as current and timely material to catch reader interest?
Nomination of editors:
1. Participating editors should be well enough known in their regions and disciplines to help identify the journal and attract authors and readers. In general, they should be established scholars, but there is also need for younger, well-published people who show promise of making significant contributions over a long period of time. [Obviously these are subjective criteria. For participating editors, we seek scholarly productivity and renown, as well as political engagement. But we also need to strike some balance between senior, well-known people and younger scholars.]

Like all LAP editors, participating editors should demonstrate a continuing commitment to the journal. Once nominated, they will be asked to review several manuscripts. Nominations will be shared with all LAP editors. [As external editors, participating editors, like associates, are expected to make regular contributions to LAP. Is this contribution something we should try to quantify? E.g., 3-4 ms reviews a year; occasional organization of a special issue or an LAP-sponsored panel at an international meeting; directing students and colleagues to the journal...]

2. By comparison, coordinating editors, who are able to participate in meetings and contribute to the month-to-month management of the journal, have very often been younger, less established scholars embarking on their careers. This should always continue to be the case.

Provisional Coordinating Editors must attend 3 consecutive meetings and review two manuscripts.

3. Associate editors are, in general, former members of the collective [while participating editors are outside, invited members of the journal.]. It is expected that Associates living in Southern California will attend at least one meeting annually, preferably the Annual Meeting.

Guidelines for Manuscript Review
Approved by Editorial Collective, March 24, 2013

Continue to move toward more screening internally with assistance of a thematic issue editor, resulting in one or two reviews that look specifically at the quality of the manuscript and whether it is ready for full review. A reply to a request for screening a manuscript is due in 7-10 days. A reply to a request for a manuscript review is due in 21 days.

1) If manuscript is screened in, it will go for full review (minimally two additional reviewers)
2) If it is screened as potentially publishable in LAP but necessitating further work before a full review, then the reviewer(s) will identify what must be done (clarity of thesis, clear theoretical direction, organization, style)
3) If screened out, a full review not necessary but reviewer(s) must identify specific problems to justify rejection.

Justification: We are swamped with too many manuscripts, we encourage revision of too many manuscripts. We wish to continue to work with authors in line with past practice and help them get their manuscripts in better shape. We desire to minimize revision. We would like to reduce our acceptance rate while continuing to be aware of issue editor preferences and our continuing emphasis on developing coherent thematic issues.

Coordinating Editor responsibility: to review a manuscript but also to coordinate all reviews of a manuscript and carry a recommendation to the collective. Our preference is to have an internal CE work with an outside editor who is not on the editorial board

Building a pool of reviewers not on the editorial board (We need suggestions from issue editors as well as all editors in an effort to build a broader list of reviewers).

Manuscripts needing translations: there have been less complaints from translators about quality of manuscripts, but we encourage our translation coordinator to quickly review each manuscript to be translated to be certain it is in publishable form (a difficult task when we are under deadlines to publish but nevertheless a continuing concern.

Film Streaming and Review Internal Policy

The content of streamed films should be consistent with the journal’s mission statement. This does not impose any restrictions on the film form. We will prioritize films that we think have social and artistic merit but that have not had significant commercial distribution in the U.S. and are unlikely to be familiar to U.S. audiences. The Film
Editors will recommend films for streaming to the Collective in a short written statement that includes a short summary and reasons for selecting the film. The recommendation should include online resources such as links to trailers, information about the filmmaker and/or visual material.

The film streaming recommendation will be circulated to the collective for feedback and will be placed on the decision list for the next meeting. During the summer break, films with unanimous approval can be accepted by the Managing Editor. If there are questions that require discussion about a film proposed during the summer, the decision will be deferred until the next meeting of the Collective to allow for discussion.

Film Review and Film-related Book Review Internal Policy

Film reviews and film-related book reviews will be handled like standard book reviews with internal review by the Collective and inclusion on the decision list. If there are conflicting reviews, decision by the Collective after discussion at a meeting, rather than post-acceptance ratification, is the preferred decision-making process. Reviews intended to coordinate with the content of a specific issue should be received at least 6 weeks prior to the deadline for submission of that issue to Sage so that there is adequate time for the review and decision process to take place. When a decision is needed during the summer break, the Managing Editor will follow normal summer decision procedures.

Minutes LAP Meeting April 10, 2016
Ron Chilcote, Fran Chilcote, George Leddy, minutes; Rosalind Bresnahan, chair; Bill Bollinger, Marjorie Bray, Ward Schinke, Jonathan Ritter, Jeannie Diaz, Kristy Wilson, Tomás Crowder Taborrelli

Check in
Fran talked about the Latin American trip. Brazil. Some sharing on situations in different countries.

1:32
Approval of the agenda.
Ron: Stavenhagen ms 14 are reviewed of 22. We have ten decisions and the ratification of Ward's review. Editor performance will be on collective only. Other editors will get reviewed at the retreat. Associate and participating editors. Political education has a handout.
Agenda approved.
Minutes approved.
Ratifications:
Rosalind brought up that the list of ms w author shows 21R with no review or indication. It might be in recording everything up to date before the meeting. 225 pages Aiskell needs to work through, Ron explained. Fran pointed out that BR288R is not on the list. DHR17 was reject. CET07RR was accept, CU45 reject. No reviews and no action on UR2-21RRR, M945R. UR2-23RRR. MOTION TO APPROVE THE RATIFICATION LIST APPROVED.

Stavenhagen MS: Ron explained the Stavenhagen ms process. We have 21. We are dealing with 14. Of the 8, STA-07 was read by Jan, who offered a big review. The ms were to go through the Mexican editors, who are editing 41 into a book. The issue is a selection from the book. Some ms have raised questions. Jan is intermediary and writing comments, which will go to the editors and authors. The problem is the time period and having to move quickly. Tim Harding reviewed one of them. He and Jan will work together on it. Jan sent Stavenhagen's response. Will be shared with the collective. Five (5) ms we are working on will be revised in some form.

Another problem from talking to Barbara Metzger. There are translations that Rosalind is handling. Barbara has to cut back redundancy among the ms. Translators need to do a good job. Marjory asked if we are obligated to take them. Jan thinks we should work with it. Ron says we are not bound to accept but our revision process will be different. The Mexican group has been doing the selection and we must clear with them. Ward explained his review since Jan thinks it should be worked with. Motion to PPSR based on Ward and Jan. Approved.

Marjorie argued that STA-05 is a speech, not an article. Jan is working on this one as well. Marjorie will defer to Jan. Motion to approve the way we are doing STA. Approved.
Decision list:

CET-00: intro to earthquake issue. Rosalind has issue w the intro. Proposes to ask author to look at the problems w building inspections. Real estate rackets, etc. Kristy thought it was thin. It needed to make better references to the material in the issue. Rosalind says it needs balance. Issue is postponed until next year. Rosalind will ask for revision. AWM

DHR-16: Marjorie says it does not belong in the issue. No reviews inside the collective. Motion to postpone pending reviews. Sheryl or Florence needs to weigh in. We have a backlog of misc stuff. 20 ms. Ron points out the editors disagree. Motion passed.

INE-03R: no internal review. Issue ends want revised. Needs other review. PPR PR. PENDING REVIEW. Sheryl will review.

M-942: like the one in the CET issue that Kristy looks at local gov response to CET. Disaster preparedness appears in both. Hammond rejects. Kristy will work from that review. Motion to postpone approved.

M-966: Tomás does not remember this one. Internal needed. Will do. PPR PENDING TOMAS. APPROVED.

NCA-01: issue editors do not like it. It ignores major aspects of the Nica revolution. Hard to get internal reviews. Almeida and Marjory. PPPR. Marjory will decide if PPSR or reject.

NEX-15R: Leddy's review is to revise. Nicole might not want to deal with it. PPPR. Hellinger will be invited to review. Motion Approved.

PRC-02: Jeannie saw that the article ignores the history of Puerto Rico and all the development programs. The article is not critical, but it pretends to be factual. It might be more appropriate in another journal. Armando says there were substantial revisions. Approved revise and resubmit.

Betances prospectus. Tomas did not like it. It accuses people of not doing work on social sciences. Ideas are unclear. George defended it. Marjory thinks there needs to be some idea as to what the articles are to be about. Some comments did not come in. It's an old discussion that is still germane. Ron points out there is an issue on democracy and human rights. Different forms of democracy. Participatory democracy or representative democracy? What of the rolling back of formal democracy? Betances has to bring all that in. Topic suggestions are needed. There were ten questions which are broad and do not provide potential authors with any guidance. Rosalind says it should be open to more approaches. The citizenship framework needs work. Emelio will be at LASA.

Buen vivir: yes. Received many reviews. All positive. Prospectus approved

Stanford lectureship: 800-900 words. LAP has relation to this lectureship to the early period of LatAm Studies. Stanford to consider any LAP editor as a scholar. We pay for people to come to UCR. Stanford recipients would be invited to one of our meetings like the LAP fellows. Stanford picks the lectures. Brochure statement approved.

We have a panel at LASA on the Cold War. Role of USA in LatAm studies. Ron has 10,000 wds so far written on this subject.

[Ron played a major role in helping NACLA survive as John Ritter pointed out that they are going back into print.] We have a journals session at LASA. Doc on LAP published by all the journals that will go up to The LASA web site.

Translation policy: Re translation: the brochure people are surprised that we pay for translation. LARR publishes on the language directly. Our intention is to be a Latin American journal and not a North American journal on Latin America. We receive over half our submissions in Spanish or Portuguese. We ask for originals when the translations are bad. Ron has published in LatAm journals. People should publish in the countries where they have studied. Rosalind suggests that we have to incorporate our translation policy into our editorial policy. Marjory
points out that reading in Spanish encourages the reviewer to see the translator as the one who will take care of problems in the details. Reviewers should help translators on editing. Some translators are too brief, others do editing that goes over.

Rafael Hernandez has approached Ron on publishing Temas, which is a major Cuban journal. Maybe Sage.

Journal page limit. The religion issue is way over the limit. 210 pp. Some of the material should be rejected. It has forced us to break up issues and push back everything. Open issue is no longer. We actually are more aggressive in rejecting articles. We do not set page limits per issue. Screening needs to be better. Ron can't find enough editors to review. Our policy is to have some internal review. At the retreat we need to discuss this. Does this really belong in LAP? Does it advance LAP? We do 10 to 16 articles in an issue. We are way bigger than LARR. This affects citations.

CLASCO: retreat topic. We will send a check for 2k though we owe them 8k. We are a Latin American journal. We need to meet with Gentilli and use their network to promote LAP. We need announcements with podcasts on their network. Tomas points out that podcasts would be better if they had a video component, which Soka can help in production. Options include TV quality or Skype.

Editor performance evaluations. Summaries are useful. These are for our collective efforts and not meant to be individual competition.

Book reviews: George is taking over from Stephanie. Kristi knows this well. Stephanie will carry on with some parts. We have cleaned up much of the backlog. Clusters are 13 now. Cluster reviews. Ward will review Tinker Salas and Hellinger. 800 wds per book. Clusters are not always related to thematic issues. Joseph coordinates and does a good job in follow thru and correspondence. George will send out the list in the next few days. Kristi will have hers this summer.

Stavenhagen has been widely read. Ron suggests we need volunteers for the Stavenhagen papers. Following editors will review the second tier of manuscripts: STA15 (Tomás C); STA 16 (Jean Diaz); STA 17 (Marjorie Bray); Sta18 (Bill Bollinger); STA 19 (Ward Schinke); STA20 (Kristi Wilson); STA 21 (George Leddy)

Ron discussed his reflections on political education. 10 points from years on the Cold War and LatAm studies. Brazil ends the notes. Jawdat wrote Ron on recent impeachment efforts against Dilma. PMDB accuses Dilma of corruption. The right wing and opposition want this impeachment crisis. Rosalind asks if the left is trying to defend corrupt left against corrupt right? Ron points out that Dilma’s defense will be in the coming week and that it is not certain that there are sufficient votes to impeach her.