

2010 Basic Course Division Business Meeting Minutes
National Communication Association
San Francisco, California, Hilton San Francisco, Union Square 25
Monday, November 15, 2010

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by the chair, Adam Jones (Illinois College). Handouts (e.g., agenda, 2009 minutes) were distributed as attendees entered the meeting.

II. Approval of Minutes of 2009 Meeting

No discussion. The minutes were approved unanimously by a voice vote.

III. Conference Organizer Report: Vice Chair Kevin Meyer (Illinois State University)

A. San Francisco Convention Report for the Division:

Kevin Meyer provided a summary of division planning for the 2010 convention.

Slots:

We had only 15 slots were available, including the business meeting. This was down from the 17 slots we had the two years prior. Our membership in the BCD is the single most important influence on our slot allotment and the easiest for us to control, so be sure to select BCD when making your division affiliations as you renew NCA membership. The Communication Assessment Division agreed to co-sponsor a panel with us, based upon the request of the panel submitter. It counted against our slot limit, although I was almost able to convince the CAD to take the slot. The NCA Editorial Policies Board had a panel submission ask us to be the co-sponsor. This was a free slot for us. We were able to transfer 4 papers and 3 paper sessions to Scholar to Scholar! Free slots for us!

Acceptance Rates:

24 papers were submitted (as compared to 17 last year; 20, 28, and 23 the years prior). Acceptance rates for previous years were 53%, 75%, 75%, and 82%. 8 papers were accepted and placed on 2 panels, plus 4 more papers were accepted to S2S (50% acceptance rate). 35 panels were submitted (as compared to 29 last year; 22, 26, and 18 the years prior). Acceptance rates for previous years were 48%, 54%, 50%, and 52%. 12 panels were accepted, plus 3 paper sessions were accepted to S2S (42.85% acceptance rate). There were not many completed papers or papers reporting data submitted. We had lots of short papers, papers without data, and extended abstracts submitted.

Service:

We had plenty of people volunteer to chair or respond. Unfortunately, because we ended up with few paper panels (as compared to panel discussions), just as in previous years, I was not able to take advantage of these volunteers.

Reviewers:

We had 35 people volunteer or be recruited to review. Only 2 did not complete reviews. Nathan Stewart and Jeff Kuznekoff completed last minute reviews in their place. All submissions were reviewed by three reviewers. Thank you to all reviewers! Reviewers generally made it easy with acceptance/rejection decisions on the paper submissions. The cut point for acceptance was 2 of the 3 reviewers recommending acceptance and high averages, *t* scores, and normalized scores. Reviewers generally made it tough to determine which panels to slot. Reviewers appeared to be much more willing to recommend acceptance of panels than papers. Most panels received 2 recommendations for acceptance, and many received 3. Ratings were also more generous. Thus, the cut point on averages, *t* scores, and normalized scores were relatively high.

All Academic:

We had some issues with submitters uploading the wrong document or submitting a paper as a panel. There were a few glitches in All Academic such as reviewers not being able to change reviews once they were submitted. And, the panel submissions did not automatically show affiliations and presenters (until I found the right option in All Academic, only after the first couple of reviewers had finished; these changes were made manually in my final calculations). Reviewers also received multiple e-mail alerts for each submission they were to review.

Reviewer Comments:

All Academic is a hindrance in two ways: it won't allow planners to require that comments be input by reviewers; and, it will not allow reviewers or planners to go back in and edit reviews once the reviewer has submitted the review. So, even though some reviewers were willing to go back and add comments after I sent a follow-up e-mail, they were not able to make those changes in All Academic. As a division, I think we need to strongly encourage if not require comments of substance. Overall, I was pleased with the results and we had most reviewers provide comments. Though, there were too many blank comments for my liking. My guess is that since most reviews were completed within 72 hours of the deadline, reviewers were scrambling to finish quickly and did not allow for sufficient time to write careful comments. Planners can talk it up and we could add something to the by-laws, but we have to get the BCD members to really buy in to the process...because All Academic will not help us enforce our wishes. One exception should be noted. Last minute reviews to cover for reviewers who fail to complete their reviews should have more leeway. To cover missing reviews I had to recruit 2 of my other reviewers to cover those extra submissions; and, with less than a 24-hour window. So, last minute reviews almost have to be down-and-dirty; fewer comments and less substance.

Overall, excluding S2S transfers (the reviews go away when it is transferred), reviewers provided comments on 67.97% of their reviews. Although not all comments contained much substance, most did. Comments were provided only 60.21% of the time for panels, but 80% of the time for papers. When categorized roughly into GTAs, pre-tenured faculty, and tenured faculty, there were interesting differences. For panels, GTAs provided comments 64.51% of the time, pre-tenured faculty only 21.05% of the time, and tenured faculty 74.41% of the time. For papers, GTAs provided comments 72.22% of the time, pre-tenured faculty only 84.61% of the time, and tenured faculty 82.75% of the time.

B. Presentation of Top Paper and Panel Awards

Top Panel Award:

“Administrative Advocacy on Campus: Engaging the Campus on Behalf of the Basic Course” consisting of Joseph Valenzano (University of Nevada, Las Vegas), David Worley (Indiana State University), Kate Thedwall (Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis), Rick Armstrong (Wichita State University), Barbara Hugenberg (Kent State University), and Deanna Fassett (San Jose State University).

Top Paper Award:

“Making an IMPACCT©: The Interactive Media Package for Assessment of Communication and Critical Thinking” by Brian Spitzberg (San Diego State University).

The other Top Four Papers were: “The Relationship between Self-generated Corrective Feedback and Speaking Performance” by Luke LeFebvre (Wayne State University), Leah LeFebvre (University of Texas-Austin), Fred Vultee (Wayne State University), Sandra Personeau-Conway (Wayne State University), and Tammy Swenson Lepper (Winona State University).

“Conflicting Advice on Oral Citations in Top Public Speaking Texts” by Katherine Kinnick and Emily Holler (Kennesaw State University)

“Does Monroe’s Motivated Sequence Work?: An Examination of the Effect of the use of Monroe’s Motivated Sequence on Listener’s Attitudes and Behavioral Intentions” by Joseph Hanson and Kimo Ah Yun (California State University-Sacramento), Jessica Russell (Michigan State University), and Catherine Puckering (University of California-Davis).

“The Dr. Larry W. Hugenberg Top Student Paper Award in the Basic Course”: Went to, for the second year in a row, William Saas (University of Nevada, Las Vegas), for his paper entitled “Bridging the Practical Gap: Imitation Pedagogy, Civic Engagement and the Basic Public Speaking Course.” Kevin forwarded this paper for consideration for the Donald P. Cushman Memorial Award for Top Overall Student Paper.

Jones thanked Meyer for his work in planning the conference this year.

IV. Nominating Committee Report and Election: Chair Angela Hosek (Emerson College), Jackie Buckrop (Ball State University), and Terry Duvall (Kent State University)

Angela announced that the following candidates were on the ballot:

Vice Chair Elect: Angela Hosek (Emerson College), Joseph P. Mazer (Clemson University), and Joseph Valenzano (University of Nevada-Las Vegas). There were no nominations from the floor. All candidates offered a brief statement on their candidacy.

Secretary: Cindy Duquette Smith (Indiana University-Bloomington), Jeff Kuznekoff (Ohio University), and Blair Thompson (Western Kentucky).

Nominating Committee: Cassandra Dickson (Denison University) and Ben Walker (Minnesota State University Moorhead). Sandy Pensoneau-Conway, Brandy Fair, William Saas, and Li Li were nominated from the floor.

Basic Communication Course Annual Editor: Stephen K. Hunt (Illinois State University) and Beth Waggenpack (Virginia Tech).

Ballots were distributed and then collected.

V. Legislative Assembly Report: Chair Adam Jones and Vice Chair Kevin Meyer

The officers jointly summarized the issues from Legislative Assembly: One of the biggest issues is that we're headed toward unsustainable organizational growth. Unit Structures Task Force is drafting a proposal to alleviate some of those issues. The way we count unit affiliations needs to change. Proposal calls for you choosing a primary unit and get a full headcount, your secondary unit would get a half headcount. All units on probation. If you were able to sustain a headcount of 100 or more, you get to be a permanent unit after two years. Second part of proposal is to change how people from units are selected for Legislative Assembly. Every unit gets two reps. A unit with more than 1,500 headcount would get 4 reps. Third part of proposal received most discussion. Three tracks: research, pedagogy, and professional. Each unit would fall into one of those tracks. A submission may go into one of those tracks. You would identify key words with your submission. Each unit would submit names for reviewers. Reviewers selected by key words. At the end, we no longer have a set number of slots. Members echoed most of the concerns proposed by the Task Force itself.

Preregistration policy has been suspended for this year and three more years. Things were not working as well as they had hoped.

We are doing well financially. Independent audit says things are stable. At some point, fees will increase.

Resolutions—elimination of student of color travel grants. Failed 10 to 115. Grants remain in place. Copyright fees at NCA—current executive director was not exercising exemptions. Fee structure was raised. Resolution passed. Fee structures will remain the same.

Motion made to support the high school speech course requirement. Motion seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Our division offers its support of the motion at Legislative Assembly.

VI. Old Business

Basic Communication Course Annual Report: Dave Worley (Indiana State University) was unable to attend. Adam Jones spoke in his place. There were 21 submissions for Volume 23. Eight were selected. Released in March. New call is forthcoming.

Karen Dwyer raised a concern that we cannot access the *BCA* in library databases.

Program of Excellence Report: Adam encouraged everyone to self-nominate their programs. The 2010 Program of Excellence Award goes to University of Nebraska-Omaha. Texas State University-San Marcos was awarded a Program of Distinction Certificate.

VII. Vice Chair-Elect Report: Melissa Broeckelman-Post (California State University-Los Angeles)

2011 conference will take place in New Orleans from Thursday, November 17 - Sunday, November 20, 2011. The 97th annual convention theme is “Voice.” Submission deadline is March 16, 2011.

Wednesday will feature “Projects with a Purpose” where members will engage with and serve the community. The way slots are allotted is changing. Every division is getting 85% of slots that it had before. A theme committee will consider all theme-related panels and papers that are submitted and related to the theme. Panels with all participants from the same university will be rejected. Work on engaging with others from other institutions.

VIII. Election Results

Angela Hosek was elected Vice Chair-Elect. Blair Thompson was elected Secretary. Cassandra Dickson (chair), Ben Walker, and Sandy Pensoneau-Conway were elected to the nominating committee.

Stephen K. Hunt was elected Editor of the *Basic Communication Course Annual*.

IX. Announcements

- A. Get on Basic Course List Serve. Contact Sam.Wallace@notes.udayton.edu
- B. Basic course conference—sign up and come to Birmingham, Alabama—January 27-28, 2011.
- C. Program of Excellence call will be circulated. Deadline will be a few months later.
- D. Steve Hunt announced that he is coordinating “Voices of Consciousness” for the 2011 NCA convention. Contact Steve for more information.
- E. There is a mini-conference on the basic course tomorrow from 11-12:15pm.
- F. ECA has a preconference for the basic course.

X. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:13 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Joseph P. Mazer.

Appendix - 2011 Unit/Affiliate Officers

Chairperson: Kevin R. Meyer (Illinois State University) kmeyer@ilstu.edu

Vice-Chairperson (and Program Planner): Melissa A. Broeckelman-Post (California State University-Los Angeles) mbroeck@exchange.calstatela.edu

Vice-Chairperson-Elect: Angela Hosek (Emerson College) Angela_Hosek@emerson.edu

Secretary: Blair Thompson (Western Kentucky University) blair.thompson@wku.edu

Immediate Past Chairperson Ex Officio: Adam Jones (Illinois College)
acjones99@hotmail.com

Legislative Assembly Representatives: Adam Jones (Illinois College)
acjones99@hotmail.com [past chairperson] and Kevin Meyer (Illinois State University)
kmeyer@ilstu.edu [chairperson]

Nominating Committee Representative: Adam Jones (Illinois College)
acjones99@hotmail.com

Nominating Committee: Cassandra Dickson (Denison University)
secreasec@denison.edu [chairperson], Ben Walker (Minnesota State University
Moorhead), and Sandy Pensoneau-Conway (Wayne State University)
sandyp@wayne.edu

BCCA editor: Stephen K. Hunt (Illinois State University) skhunt2@ilstu.edu