

Editors' Note

Gunnar Ólafur Hansson,¹ Ashley Farris-Trimble,² Kevin McMullin,³ and
Douglas Pulleyblank¹

¹University of British Columbia, ²Simon Fraser University and ³University of Ottawa

1 Introduction

The collection of papers published here reflects presentations at the 2015 Annual Meeting on Phonology (AMP 2015), jointly hosted by the University of British Columbia and Simon Fraser University, which took place at the UBC Robson Square campus in Vancouver on October 9–11, 2015. The Proceedings contain papers that were presented orally, while the papers in the Supplemental Proceedings were presented as posters. Please cite papers using the following format, substituting ‘Supplemental Proceedings’ for ‘Proceedings’ as appropriate:

Authors. 2016. Paper title. Hansson, Gunnar Ólafur, Farris-Trimble, Ashley, McMullin, Kevin and Pulleyblank, Douglas (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2015 Annual Meeting on Phonology*. Linguistic Society of America, Washington, DC. URL.

In addition to 3 invited plenary talks, AMP 2015 featured 16 oral and 48 poster presentations, all refereed. The first day of the conference also featured three methods-oriented tutorials. The full program is archived on the conference website at <http://blogs.ubc.ca/amp2015>. Note that a few papers or posters that were presented at the conference were not submitted for publication in these proceedings.

The conference was a great success, attended by 159 registered participants. We would like to thank presenters and other attendees for making AMP 2015 a wonderfully collegial and stimulating event. Our thanks to the various organizations and individuals who made the conference possible through their generous support and contributions are expressed below.

2 Statistics

In total, 101 abstracts were received. Of these, 16 were accepted as oral presentations and 56 as poster presentations, for a total of 72 accepted submissions. The acceptance rate was thus 71% overall, but 16% for acceptance as an oral presentation. (Only one submission had specifically requested poster rather than oral presentation.) Of the 56 submissions that were accepted as posters, 8 were subsequently withdrawn, resulting in the total of 48 posters on the final program. Given recent discussion in our field of the representation of women and junior researchers at academic conferences in linguistics in general and phonology in particular (e.g. on the Phonolist blog, <https://blogs.umass.edu/phonolist/tag/representation-of-women/>), we would like to contribute some additional numbers here.

The breakdown by gender was as follows: 50/101 or 50% of the abstracts received had a female sole or lead author; the acceptance rate for these was 34/50 or 68% overall, and 12/50 or 24% as oral presentations. In comparison, the corresponding figures for submissions with a male sole or lead author were an acceptance rate of 38/51 or 75% overall and 4/51 or 8% as oral presentations. With respect to the final program, 12 of the 16 oral presentations (75%) and 21 of the 48 posters (44%) had a female lead or sole author. Counting lead and non-lead authors alike, the overall proportion of female authors was 72/150 or 48% on the 101 submitted abstracts and 51/113 or 45% on the 72 accepted submissions (16/26 or 62% on the 16 oral presentations). Finally, two of the three invited plenary speakers and two of the three tutorial presenters were female, as were four of the ten session chairs (who were all faculty members at UBC or SFU and/or members of the AMP Steering Committee).

As to the relative academic seniority of authors (using an admittedly somewhat arbitrary classification),

the breakdown of the final conference program was as follows with respect to lead or sole authors. For the 16 oral presentations, 37% were by graduate students, 19% by junior scholars (within 8 years of their doctorate) and 44% by mid-career or more established scholars. For the 48 poster presentations, the division was: 58% by graduate students, 25% by junior scholars and 17% by mid-career/established scholars. For graduate student lead/sole authors on submitted abstracts, the acceptance rate was 66% overall, while for junior scholars it was 67% and for mid-career/established scholars 90%. For acceptance as oral presentation, the corresponding rates were 12%, 13% and 35%, respectively.

3 Review process

Of the 101 abstracts received, three were rejected outright; the remaining 98 were distributed for anonymous peer review to an international scientific committee consisting of 58 scholars who had accepted our invitation to referee abstracts for AMP 2015. Nearly all abstracts were assessed and rated by 4 reviewers; no abstract received fewer than 3 reviews. The Program Committee (consisting of the editors of this proceedings volume) then made acceptance decisions based on the ratings and reviews; only the highest-rated submissions were selected for oral presentation. The number of acceptances for oral and poster presentations was largely dictated by limitations of scheduling and space at the conference venue. Special attention was given to those abstracts that fell in the border region around the cut-offs for oral vs. poster presentation or acceptance vs. rejection, in particular if there were significant discrepancies among reviewers.

Overall, the peer review process went smoothly. However, there were a small handful of reviews that contained unnecessarily hostile, judgmental wording (e.g. ridiculing the theoretical approach adopted or belittling the merits of the research question) that bordered on unprofessional behaviour. In two cases authors found a reviewer's comments offensive enough to take the matter up with the conference organizers. With nearly 400 reviews it is perhaps not surprising to find cases where an author takes issue with the content or tone of a review. Nevertheless, there is no justification for hostility and *ad hominem* criticism and we would urge our fellow phonologists to strive for the highest standards of professionalism and courtesy when serving as anonymous peer reviewers.

4 Funding

Financial support for AMP 2015 was generously provided by the University of British Columbia and Simon Fraser University, for which we express our gratitude. Specifically, we received funding and in-kind support from the UBC Vice President, Research and International, the SFU Vice-President, Academic, the UBC Dean of Arts, the SFU Dean of Arts and Social Sciences, and the UBC and SFU Departments of Linguistics. Some additional funding came from research grants held by individual UBC or SFU faculty members.

5 Acknowledgments

First of all, we would like to acknowledge the Coast Salish peoples on whose ancestral, traditional and unceded territory AMP 2015 took place. We were honoured to have Larry Grant, Elder from the Musqueam First Nation and Adjunct Professor of First Nations and Endangered Languages at UBC, give a welcome address on the first day of the conference.

Aside from the various UBC and SFU units who provided financial support as detailed above, we are also grateful to the administrative staff of the UBC and SFU Linguistics departments, especially Edna Dharmaratne, Silvana Di Tosto, Shaine Meghji and Rita Parmar, for their help with various administrative and financial issues along the way.

As organizers of past AMP conferences, and as members of the AMP Steering Committee, Joe Pater and Adam Albright were very helpful in sharing information, resources and useful advice. Joe deserves special thanks for his help with publishing these proceedings, as do James MacDonald and Alyson Reed of the Linguistic Society of America. Joe and Adam also chaired sessions at the conference, as did Rachel Walker, organizer of the upcoming AMP 2016 conference.

We would like to thank the many faculty members, graduate and undergraduate students at UBC and SFU who contributed indispensable assistance and hours of volunteer labour to various aspects of the planning, organizing and running of AMP 2015: assigning abstracts to reviewers, maintaining the conference website,

researching travel information, arranging and compiling the registration packets, organizing volunteers, manning the registration table, and chairing sessions, to name just a few of the major tasks. Thanks in particular go to faculty members John Alderete, Kathleen Currie Hall and Yue Wang, and to students Blake Allen, Andrei Anghelescu, Zoe Lam, Avery Ozburn, Danica Reid and Natalie Weber.

Finally, we sincerely thank the abstract reviewers for their generous help in selecting the talks and posters for AMP 2015: Adam Albright, Arto Anttila, Eric Baković, Michael Becker, Ryan Bennett, Will Bennett, Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero, Lev Blumenfeld, Ellen Broselow, Marc Brunelle, Eugene Buckley, Andries Coetzee, Robert Daland, Lisa Davidson, Stuart Davis, Emily Elfner, Darin Flynn, Gillian Gallagher, Heather Goad, Matt Gordon, Jeff Heinz, Patrick Honeybone, José Hualde, Elizabeth Hume, Brett Hyde, Gaja Jarosz, Karen Jesney, Peter Jurgec, Yoonjung Kang, Aaron Kaplan, Darya Kavitskaya, Shigeto Kawahara, Michael Kenstowicz, Yuni Kim, Wendell Kimper, Paul Kiparsky, Martin Krämer, Haruo Kubozono, Sara Mackenzie, Giorgio Magri, Michael Marlo, Jeff Mielke, Rebecca Morley, Scott Myers, Joe Pater, Sharon Peperkamp, Kathryn Pruitt, Anne Pycha, Keren Rice, Kevin Ryan, Jennifer Smith, Brian Smith, Anne-Michelle Tessier, Jochen Trommer, Ruben van de Vijver, Rachel Walker and Kristine Yu.