1. **Opening by Erica Scharrer (Chair)**
   a. Introduction of CAM officers:
      i. Sahara Byrne, incoming chair
      ii. Jessica Taylor Piotrowski, incoming Vice Chair
      iii. Karin Fikkers, Secretary
      iv. Grad student/Emerging scholars representative: Fashina Aladé
   b. New officers needed:
      i. A new Secretary is to be elected in the fall. This Secretary will take
         over from Karin after the next annual conference in Japan. Email
         Sahara Byrne (seb272@cornell.edu) for more information if you’re
         interested.
      ii. CAM is also looking for someone who would like to take over as
          Internationalization liaison from Jessica. This position is not subject to
          election. If you’re interested, please email Sahara Byrne
          (seb272@cornell.edu).
   c. Sahara will be program planner for Fukuoka; Jessica will plan San Diego and
      Prague.
   d. Members are very enthusiastic about the new CAMmer in the Spotlight
      initiative started by Karin.
   e. Currently CAM has 304 members, of which about 50% is international. CAM
      has been hovering around 300 for the past three years.

2. **Approve minutes of last year’s business meeting in Seattle (Erica)**
   a. Minutes are approved.

3. **Institute of Digital Media and Child Development (Pamela Hurst-DellaPietra)**
   a. Pamela introduces the Institute for Digital Media and Child Development, a
      new initiative to bridge the gap between medical, neuroscience, and social
      science communities, as well as foster a national dialogue about children’s
      media.
   b. The institute organizes a national conference, October 13-16 2015, Beckman
      Conference Center, Irvine, CA.
   c. More information on the website [www.childrenandscreens.org](http://www.childrenandscreens.org) or via email
      Pamela.
4. Finances (Erica)
   a. Expenses at this year’s conference:
      i. Awards: $500
      ii. Plaques: $300
      iii. Reception: $1500
   b. CAM’s income: increased dues via ICA.
   c. A big thank you to those who have made contributions to CAM:
      i. Taylor and Francis (Katherine Burton and Sophie Wade): $750
      ii. Patti Valkenburg, redirect of funds received from ICA for being plenary speaker: $1400
         iii. University of Massachusetts Amherst (Institution of Erica Scharrer):
              $250
         iv. Cornell University (Institution of Sahara Byrne): $250

5. This year’s conference: Puerto Rico (Erica)
   a. This year is the second largest conference (second only to London’s conference). More than 4000 submissions, 2600 attendees. Acceptance rate was increased to 45% generally (used to be around 35%), around 60% in CAM. The challenge of increasing acceptance rate is thus met around all ICA. CAM managed to increase the acceptance rate by accepting more posters (number of posters was tripled), and by trying out new formats. New ICA policy to recognize Top Posters (based on content of the papers, not visual display).

6. Next year’s conference: Fukuoka, Japan (Erica; Amy Jordan)
   a. Fukuoka is a sea-side city situated in the south-west corner of Japan. There are direct flights from several large cities, so it is not as hard to reach as people may think.
   b. Although Fukuoka is supposed to be lovely, ICA and CAM have heard concerns about it being too expensive. However, if the yen stays at its current rate, the hotel rate will be $111 a night next year. In addition, the food is less expensive than in the Hilton in San Juan. Air fares may be pricier, though.
   c. The hotel will include breakfast, and ICA is also negotiating lunch into the conference fee.
   d. If the number of submissions stays high, ICA may experiment with programming later to the day on the last day. That is, Monday may end later than normal next year depending on submissions.
   e. Conference theme is Communicating with Power. The new president-elect is interested in questions such as: How do we communicate to power? How do we help those without power? How can we use communication to find power? And, as researchers and scholars, how can we be more powerful to get our message out there?
7. This year’s CAM program (Sahara Byrne, program planner)
   a. Second highest acceptance rate: 134 CAM submissions accepted (60%), as well as 4 panel submissions (50%). Sahara aimed to promote CAM’s value of mentorship, as well as areas in which many people are doing research when working on the planning.
   b. Two new formats:
      i. “hybrid sessions” with 5-minute presentations followed by posters. These sessions consisted of papers that were on a similar topic AND highly rated in the review process.
      ii. Escalator sessions in which junior scholars can discuss their on-going work with senior CAM scholars.
   c. CAM also still featured 9 traditional sessions, and 10 posters in the plenary session. Submissions that are selected for presentation in the plenary poster session are selected because they are quite unique and are difficult to fit in a traditional session – definitely not based on score!
   d. Research escalator sessions received 40 submissions of junior scholars interested in mentorship. 19 submissions were accepted into 2 escalator sessions. Sahara personally solicited help from senior scholars in getting these sessions together, a big thank you to them! If you’d like to be a mentor next year, please email Sahara.
   e. Awards committee: The Awards committee needs new reviewers. Top papers in CAM are first selected on the highest scores, and then a group of these top-scoring papers is reviewed by the Awards committee to select the best papers. Additional members are needed for Awards for Senior Scholar, Top Article, and Top Dissertation. If you are interested in serving on the Awards Committee, please email Jessica (j.pirotowski@uva.nl) and inform her for which Award you would like to review.
   f. Feedback: Sahara asks the members at the business meeting what they think of the “hybrid high density sessions”. CAM members seem to like the sessions, and think it is a great way of hearing a lot of different research on one topic. Perhaps next year, presenters can be a little better informed about what is expected from their 5-minute presentation. This is not intended to be a full-information presentation, but rather a teaser to be followed up with their poster. Sahara may make a template next year. Sahara will also send out a survey about the new sessions in order to learn what CAM members like about it as well as what could be further improved.
   g. Higher acceptance rate: There may have been concerns that quality of the presentations may go down with a higher rate, but this was definitely not the case in Puerto Rico. All included papers in this year’s conference (60% of all submissions) were highly ranked papers. In her experience as this year’s program planner, there was now a natural break in how the papers were being rated, and the best papers were accepted. Sahara loves CAM members’ input about the quality of the work at this year’s conference.
8. ICA Fellows (Dafna Lemish)
   a. Divisions should have an active role in nominating scholars from their ranks so they can have a role in the ICA fellows organization. We have plenty of outstanding scholars in CAM that might become fellows.
   b. Dafna notes that there are not that many nominations when looking at how much expertise is in ICA or at how many can become fellow each year. For example, there were only 8 nominations this year, 7 were passed. And there are so many deserving fellows in CAM. Dafna urges CAM members to take initiative here.
   c. She also notes that all nominees this year were men. CAM is biased towards women. Please help promote gender equality. 87 living ICA fellows only 33% women, only 18% international. We should pay attention to diversity.
   d. Nominate many people from CAM. Think carefully about how to make the nomination persuasive. Tackle potential “disadvantages”. Consider diversity. And be strategic about what are criteria of excellence in our discipline/area of specialty.

9. New business / News from ICA board meeting (Erica)
   a. The ICA mid-year board meeting discussed results from the survey that was sent out by Amy Jordan last fall. Among ICA members there are mixed feelings about whether acceptance rate was too low or not. Some felt it was too high, others too low, others felt it was ok. Perhaps members are concerned about quality and think that the quality may go down if more submissions are accepted. We must certainly be weary of “overadjusting”.
   b. Other concerns from the survey are about lack of senior scholars on the schedule. Sahara and Erica responded by creating research escalators.
   c. There’s a new task force that is still in formation looking at quality of the review process. Some people are concerned about integrity or quality of reviews. CAM members are asked about their thoughts on this process or how to improve this:
      i. CAM members would like more transparency about the reviewers and their qualifications. Perhaps reviewers can indicate their own expertise (topical/methodological) when providing a review.
         - Sahara used keywords to try and assign best reviewers for a topic. However, if keywords were provided, they were not always very informative (e.g., “children and media”). Please update your research description on the ICA website to include more detailed methodological, theoretical and topic descriptions. In addition, if you receive(d) papers to review that were not in your area of expertise, please inform Sahara.
- Please review again for CAM next year! We need good reviewers, and CAM has a very strong tradition in this respect.
- CAM can start building up a culture of expertise reporting in the first sentence of a review.
- Sahara notes that she noticed a high correlation among scores, so reviewers were quite in agreement about at least the top 45% of papers.

2. It is asked whether the program planner looks at the numeric scores only or also considers the qualitative comments.
   - Sahara only used the numeric scores.

   o Three new proposals from Sahara and Erica for a structural change in CAM:
     1. Proposal 1: Secretary and Vice Chair head up awards committees (for VC in the year inducted and the non-programming year). NOTE: Vice Chair has already historically headed up awards in non-programming year.
     2. Proposal 2: Grad student/emerging scholars representative works with Chair and Vice Chair to organize material for CAM website, informal gathering at conference.
     3. Proposal 3: If ICA issues registration fee waivers, we propose this be the priority of assignment:
        - 1) Top Student-Led paper winner
        - 2) Top Dissertation winner
        - 3) Graduate Student Representative

10. Grad students/Emerging Scholars (Fashina Aladé)
    a. Brand new position created last year. Didn’t get very far this year. They had a meeting at ICA with “grad student and early career representatives”. Goal: Make themselves more easily findable so students/junior scholars can easily come with questions. Also talked about how to create program elements specifically for emerging scholars, such as a preconference. Fashina emphasizes that blue sky workshops are specifically meant to be more interactive and targeted at emerging scholars, are also about different professionalization issues. Shina will be sending out a survey to get feedback about how you feel about research escalators etc.

11. Next year (Erica)
    a. Preconferences: CAM didn’t organize one this year, because last year’s cosponsored preconference in Seattle was not so well attended. Any ideas for preconference in Japan?
        i. Not at this moment.
b. Sahara asks whether research escalator should move to preconference mode? Many people would need to come early, so that would also cost more money. CAM members note that some universities only fund the main conference and not preconference. Sahara also heard from many people that the only reason they could come is because of research escalator in main conference.

**Awards**

Competition was very fierce this year, with many worthy pieces of scholarship, so congratulations to all winners!

**Top scoring Posters**
- Children as Players on An Adult Stage: Representations of Boys and Girls on Israeli Prime Time Reality Programmes
  - Daliea Liran Alper; Shelly Geffen
- Learning from the "Blue Monster": Children’s reality Judgements and transfer from TV to Real Life
  - James Alex Bonus; Marie-Louise Mares
- "There's Many Ways that I Know He Can Read": Toward an Asset Model of Childhood Disability and Children’s Media Use
  - Meryl Alper

**Top Student-led Paper**
- Maternal Stress as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Mothers? Attitudes and Children’s Television Viewing
  - Ine Beyens, U of Leuven - School for Mass Communication Research; Steven Eggermont, U of Leuven - School for Mass Communication Research; Amy Nathanson, Ohio State U

**Top Overall Papers**
- The Effect of Playing With Video Game Avatars on Self-Objectification in Adolescent Boys and Girls
  - Laura P. Vandenbosch, ASCoR - University of Amsterdam; Karolien Driesmans, University of Leuven; Jolien Trekels, & Steven Eggermont U of Leuven - School for Mass Communication Research
- Sparking Interest, Modeling Consumption: A Contingency Model for Youth News Socialization
  - Stephanie Edgerly, Northwestern University; Kjerstin Thorson, University of Southern California; Esther Thorson, U of Missouri; Emily K Vraga, George Mason University; Leticia Bode, Georgetown University
Top Dissertation

- Simone de Droog, Radboud University Nijmegen, for "Establishing and Explaining the Impact of Characters on Young Children's Healthy Food Choices"
  - From nominator Moniek Buijzen, “The work that she pursued has the conceptual rigor, methodological sophistication, and theoretical creativity that characterize exceptional research. Her thesis represents a significant and long needed advance in our understanding of the effects and mechanisms of healthy food promoting (media) characters among very young children. Moreover, it is truly outstanding in its societal relevance, and in the way the research findings have been applied to health interventions in the Netherlands.”

Senior Scholar

- Patti Valkenburg, University of Amsterdam
  - From nominator Jessica Piotrowski, “Arguably one of the leading communication scientists of our time, Patti has spent the last 25 years studying children’s relationship with media. Focusing largely on the cognitive, emotional, and social effects of media and technologies on children, teens, and young adults, her contribution to the field is vast and long-lasting. Her curriculum vitae counts over 130 peer-reviewed articles, 38 book chapters, and 5 books...Her work has been cited more than 8,000 times, and in a review published in Communication Reports (2006, v. 20), Valkenburg was listed among the top 15 most prolific communication scholars.”

Thank you to

All mentors:

- Lynn Schofield Clark
- Nicole Martins
- Ron Leone
- Sonya Dal Cin
- Srivi Ramasubramanian
- David Ewoldsen
- Lara Zwarun
- Sun Sun Lim
- Nancy Jennings
- Renee Hobbs
- Erica Scharrer
- Rod Carveth
- Agnes Lucy Lando
Jan van den Bulk
Roger Desmond
Jessica Piotrowski
Lee Humphreys
Sahara Byrne
Moniek Buijzen

Awards committee:
- TOP PAPERS Award Committee
  - Brad Bond
  - Emily Moyer Gusé
  - Amy Nathanson
  - Eric Rasmussen
  - Kathleen Beullens
  - Nicole Martins
- And for Senior Scholar, added to the above
  - Ellen Wartella
  - Sonia Livingstone

Chairs & Respondents