

Southern States Communication Association Executive Council Meeting

Wednesday, March 28, 2007; 6:00 – 8:00 p.m., Salon G

Thursday, March 29, 2007; 8:00 – 11:00 a.m., Salon G

2007 SSSA Annual Convention, Louisville, KY

Charles H. Tardy, SSSA President, presiding

AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Welcome**
- 3. Approval of Minutes of SSSA Executive Council Meeting, San Antonio, TX.: Friday, November 17, 2006, 2:00 – 4:45 p.m. (published on the SSSA Web Page at <http://www.sssa.net/about/minutes/2006/index.php>)**
- 4. Approval of Agenda**
- 5. Officers' Reports:**
 - 5.1 President – Charles H. Tardy**
 - 5.2 Vice President – Craig Allen Smith**
 - 5.3 Immediate Past President & Nominating Committee – Ken Cissna**
 - 5.4 Vice President Elect – Jerold R. Hale**
 - 5.5 Executive Director – J. Emmett Winn**
 - 5.6 Advertising Manager – Jean DeHart**
 - 5.7 SCJ Editor – John Meyer**
 - 5.8 NCA Legislative Assembly Representatives – David Sutton, Deborah Hefferin, Monette Callaway-Ezell**
 - 5.9 NCA Nominating Committee Representative - Kim Golombisky**
- 6. Standing Committee Reports**
 - 6.1 Committee on Committees – Charles Tardy**
 - 6.2 Constitution – Norma Cook**
 - 6.3 Finance – Patricia Amason**
 - 6.4 Local Arrangements –William Thompson**
 - 6.5 Minority Recruitment and Retention – Michael Eaves**
 - 6.6 Publications – David Cratis Williams**
 - 6.7 Resolutions – Karyn Brown**
 - 6.8 Resource Development – Frances Brandau-Brown**
 - 6.9 Time and Place – Katherine Hendrix**
- 7. Division Reports**
 - 7.1 Applied Communication – David Gesler**
 - 7.2 Communication Theory – Cole Franklin**
 - 7.3 Community College – Robin Jensen**
 - 7.4 Freedom of Speech – Susan Mallon Ross**
 - 7.5 Gender Studies – Sandra Halvorson**
 - 7.6 Instructional Development – Richard Quianthy**
 - 7.7 Intercultural Communication – Mary Rucker**
 - 7.8 Interpersonal Communication – Michael Arrington**
 - 7.9 Language and Social Interaction – Christine S. Davis**
 - 7.10 Mass Communication – Tony DeMars**
 - 7.11 Performance Studies – W. Jay Baglia**
 - 7.12 Political Communication – John Allen Hendricks**
 - 7.13 Popular Communication – Wendy Jean Hajjar**
 - 7.14 Public Relations – Brigitta Brunner**
 - 7.15 Rhetoric and Public Address – Jim Kuypers**
 - 7.16 Southern Forensics Association – Jason Hough**
- 8. Unfinished Business**
- 9. New Business**
 - 9.1 Ad hoc committee on Association Awards Policies Report: Marilyn Young**
 - 9.2 Ad hoc Committee on Electronic Submissions Report: Joy Hart**
 - 9.3 Ad hoc Committee on Research Support Guidelines Report: Andy King**
- 10. Announcements and Adjournment**

1. **Call to Order:** President Tardy called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.
2. **Welcome:** Tardy welcomed all present. In attendance: Tardy, President; Winn, Executive Dir.; Hale, VP elect; Amason, Finance Comm.; Webb, Finance Comm.; Quianthy, IDD; Hefferin, NCA LA Rep.; Jensen, CCD; Halvorson, Gender Div.; Hawkins, Finance Comm.; Meyer, SCJ Editor; Cook, Constitution Comm. & Freedom of Speech Div.; Kuypers, Pub. Add.; Collins; Young, RDC & Ad hoc on Awards Policy; Callaway-Ezell, NCA LA Rep & Political Comm.; Brandau-Brown, RDC; Frank, Freshley Award; Davis, LSI Div.; Hough, SFD; Rucker, IC Div.; Smith, VP; Brown, Resolutions Comm.; DeHart, Ad Mgr.; Eaves, Minority Recruitment; Sutton, NCA LA Rep.; Franklin, Comm Theory; DeMars, Mass Comm.; Hart, Ad Hoc on Electronic Submissions; Hendrix, T&P.
3. **Approval of Minutes of SSCA Executive Council Meeting, San Antonio, TX.:** Friday, November 17, 2006, 2:00 – 4:45 p.m. (published on the SSCA Web Page at <http://www.scca.net/about/minutes/2006/index.php>. The minutes were approved.
4. **Approval of Agenda:** The agenda was approved.
5. **Officers' Reports:**
 - 5.1 **President – Charles H. Tardy**

Since assuming the role of SSCA President, I have performed two primary functions. First, I have tended to the structure of the association. The Committee on Committees met on the last day of the spring convention, discussed appointments to all our committees, and charged me with securing the appointments to these positions. Over the summer I carried out this responsibility, appointing 17 individuals to standing committees. Subsequently I launched each committee by giving its chair a detailed charge. For many, I included a request that the committee prepare a set of guidelines for performing their normal duties. Additionally, I appointed 12 individuals to 4 ad-hoc committees. I have monitored the work of these committees over the year, and we will hear the results of their deliberations in subsequent reports.

The second function I've performed has been to guide our strategic planning activities. After discussions with other officers, I called a strategic planning meeting for the weekend of June 23-25. Invited were the members of the executive committee and all members of the finance committee, though not everyone could attend. Ken Cissna suggested we hold these meeting in the north Georgia town of Ellijay, and subsequently was a gracious host and local arrangements chair. We met for about 3 hours on a Friday evening at his cabin on the Cartecay River, and then spent all day Saturday and Sunday morning meeting at a local motel. A detailed report of these discussions is or will soon be available on the SSCA website. But to summarize as briefly as I can, we evaluated our association's efforts in 5 areas identified in the previous strategic plan (professional development of members, relational development of members, organizational development, organizational identity, and services) and formulated more than 30 specific recommendations. Perhaps more importantly, the meeting enabled the officers to orient themselves to the problems and opportunities of our association and to reinforce their commitment to working together to enhance our association. Immediately after that meeting I recruited members to share our vision of the association and serve on ad hoc committees to carry out some of these recommendations.

The executive committee met in San Antonio to review these recommendations and continue our work on them. Some of these recommendations related to the functions of the executive director and have been successfully implemented by Emmett Winn. His hard work to bring these ideas to fruition is much appreciated. We had many ideas and suggestions for improving our conventions and these have been considered, modified, and where appropriate implemented by Craig Smith and Jerry Hale. I appreciate their efforts in this regard. Some ideas and issues were referred to committees, ad hoc and regular. Reports of their findings will be made at this convention. I have addressed as many of the items designated to the president as I could.

I am pleased that we implemented as many of these as we have. No doubt our reach exceeded our grasp so there will still be items for Craig to deal with when he takes the helm. I think the planning session was vital to developing ideas and directions for improving our association and applaud the efforts of the many people who have worked to bring them to fruition.

One item that emerged from these discussions deserves special notice. The executive committee decided at the NCA meeting that we should have a conference call of officers, the finance committee, and the accountants who performed our financial review. The purpose of this would be twofold: 1) to ensure that everyone understood the review and had a chance to ask any questions about it; and, 2) to ask the accountants if they had any suggestions for improving our financial or business practices. In February I contacted the accountants and SSCA officers, and then arranged a meeting time that would accommodate as many of these people as possible. We subsequently had a 45 minute teleconference. This session affirmed our understanding of the financial status of our association, which is

solid, and also generated ideas for the officers and finance committee to consider. Some were immediately accepted, some immediately rejected, and others are being acted upon or considered by appropriate bodies. I think this was a prudent and useful meeting that will help us strengthen the financial practices of our association. Again, I appreciate the involvement and cooperation of the elected officers, the finance committee, and the executive director. It is imperative that we work together in these matters.

I'd like to conclude by thanking the many individuals who are carrying out our association's business. Securing the committee appointments brought to my awareness how many people are actively involved in the operation of our association. Counting standing and ad-hoc committee members, division officers, etc., there are more than a hundred individuals performing some part of our business. That's about 1 out of every 5 members. This seems to me an extraordinary ratio and testament to the breadth of commitment by our members. I appreciate your help. The SSCA couldn't exist without it.

**Charles H. Tardy,
SSCA President**

Addendum to the President's Report: A motion to amend the constitution (Article IV; Section 4; A) by: 6. Facilitate the performance of the constitutional duties of all other officers and committees.

The motion was moved, seconded and passed with no dissention.

5.2 Vice President – Craig Allen Smith: Smith presented the program for the convention and thanked all involved with its work. He closed by encouraging the membership to provide feedback on the convention.

5.3 Immediate Past President & Nominating Committee – Ken Cissna: Cissna was unable to attend so VP Smith reported the results of the election.

5.4 Vice President Elect – Jerold R. Hale

The main responsibility of the Vice President Elect is to program the Theodore Clevenger Undergraduate Honors Conference (UHC). There are several important changes to the format of the conference this year. The changes were made after lengthy discussions with the SSCA officers at the annual meeting last year and the summer retreat. Let me briefly report on four changes to the UHC.

First, there has been a problem in previous years of student papers being accepted for presentation but not being presented. Some students claimed they had not submitted their papers and so they did not feel obligated to present them. The submission process was changed for the 2007 UHC so that students had to request their papers be reviewed for possible inclusion into the program. Prior to the conference, only two students had withdrawn from participation. At least one of the students had made arrangements for a colleague to make the presentation. I will have complete data at the end of the conference regarding the number of papers that were not presented. My sense is that progress is being made related to this issue but that it will need to be revisited.

Second, a major concern voiced by past participants is that the UHC spanned the entire weekend of the SSCA conference. There is an expectation that students will be present for the entire UHC. The problem is that expectation places a financial hardship on students because most of them do not receive significant institutional support for participating. This year two UHC panels are scheduled for some time slots. That allowed us to make the UHC a Thursday, Friday, and Saturday event. The downside to this strategy is that students will attend some panels and not others. We will be seeking feedback from participants related to the new format and I will communicate that feedback to the Vice President Elect-Elect.

Third, a kickoff breakfast was substituted for the Awards Luncheon for UHC participants. The Franklin Shirley Awards for the top UHC papers will be presented at the breakfast. Feedback we had received was that the overwhelming majority of UHC participants did not attend the luncheon and those who did found attending not terribly useful or interesting.

Fourth, this year two Franklin Shirley Awards will be presented instead of one. My thought was the papers were so diverse as to make comparing papers with radically different methods and underlying epistemologies like comparing apples to oranges. One of awards will be presented to the top rhetorical/critical paper and another will be presented to the top social scientific paper. I understand that in other years that dichotomy may lack utility but it did appear to capture the range of possibilities this year.

Ninety-four papers were submitted for review and possible presentation at the UHC for 2007. Over those, 77 papers authored or co-authored by 103 students, were paneled. The authors and co-authors are students at 30 different colleges and universities. Each paper was read by two reviewers. The reviewers rated each paper on a scale from 0 to 100 where higher scores represented better work and each reviewer made a yes/no judgment about whether a paper should be programmed. The ratings were converted to z-scores. To be programmed a paper had to receive at least one “yes” vote and have a z-score of -1.25. Decisions regarding whether a paper was programmed were based on higher.

Finally, I would like to thank the following persons for reviewing papers and/or agreeing to serve as program Chairs or Respondents:

Patricia Amason, University of Arkansas
Jarrod Atchison, University of Georgia,
Wendy Atkins-Sayre, Agnes Scott College
J. Kevin Barge, University of Georgia
Vanessa Beasley, University of Georgia
Jennifer L. Beaven, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Richard Bello, Sam Houston State University
Sally Blomstrom, Chadron State University
Kristen Davis, University of Central Florida
Megan Dillow, University of West Virginia

Kellt Dorgan, East Tennessee State University
Tasha Dubrwin, University of South Florida
Kelli Lynn Fellows, Appalachian State University
Sonja Brown Givens, University of Alabama, Huntsville
Robert E. Frank, Morehead State University
Victoria Gallagher, North Carolina State University
Todd Goen, University of Georgia
John Haas, University of Tennessee
Tina M. Harris, University of Georgia
Brian Householder, University of North Dakota
Thomas Lessl, University of Georgia
Kenneth Levine, University of Tennessee
Kristy Maddux, University of Georgia
Roseann Mandziuk, Texas State University
Edward M. Panetta, University of Georgia
John M. Murphy, University of Georgia
Rhonda Parker, Samford University
Ashli Stokes, University of North Carolina, Charlotte
Mary Stuckey, Georgia State University
David Sutton, Auburn University
M. Rachel Tighe, University of Virginia, Wise
Kandi Walker, University of Louisville
Michael Waltmann, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Patrick Wheaton, Georgia Southern University
Caitlyn Wills-Toker, Gainesville State College
Dylan Wolfe, Clemson University
Melissa J. Young, Texas Christian University

5.5 Executive Director – J. Emmett Winn: Winn expressed his thanks:

To the officers for outstanding service and reminded all present that each officer will be honored at the Awards Banquet on Saturday.

to Amason, Webb, and Hawkins for their hard work on the finance committee;

to Marriott for sponsoring a continental breakfast for the Breakfast Business meeting;

to the Executive Director staff, Jennifer McCullars Johnson, Martha Isom, and Nicole McDavid;

to Frances Brandau-Brown, Todd Goen, and Marilyn Young for their work on the Resource Development Committee;

and to Mary Helen Brown, Chair of the Department of Communication and Journalism for her support of SSCA.

Winn finished his by making a formal report on membership figures, the budget, and the annual Financial Review.

Winn also chaired the Ad Hoc Committee on defining the responsibilities of the new Marketing Director position which will, if approved, replace the current Advertising Manager position. Winn presented his committee's recommendations as follows:

Proposed SSCA Marketing Director Responsibilities

The Marketing Director is responsible for development, implementation, and evaluation of association marketing activities. These include, but are not limited to: strategic planning, preparing and implementing various marketing activities, membership development and maintenance, organizational branding, securing advertising, and expansion of state, regional, and national organizational awareness.

Specific responsibilities include:

Strategic Planning:

- 1. Identify marketing needs and/or opportunities for the association in conjunction with the Executive Committee**
- 2. Set realistic goals for each year**

Marketing Activities:

- 1. Work with the Executive Director and Executive Committee in design, production, and distribution of promotional materials including flyers, brochures, newsletters, and other collateral information**
- 2. Develop and implement e-mail marketing campaigns and other special promotions in association with the Executive Committee**
- 3. Attend various relevant meetings and act as a representative of the organization as directed by the Executive Committee**

Membership Development and Maintenance:

1. Evaluate and assess membership trends and needs
2. Develop instruments and reports related to membership tracking and needs assessment

Funding:

1. Procure advertising for the annual convention program
2. Coordinate exhibits for the annual convention
3. Act as a liaison to convention exhibitors

Awareness:

1. Develop and implement campaigns to enhance association awareness at the state, regional, and national levels
2. Foster relationships with leaders of state, regional, and national communications associations
3. Identify underrepresented areas (local or state) within the association

Winn moved that the recommendations be accepted. The motion passed without dissention.

5.6 Advertising Manager – Jean DeHart: DeHart reported the total sales in Ads and exhibits for the convention. She encouraged everyone to read the program ads and to visit the vendors. She thanked Allyn and Bacon for their support of the Osborn reception and Florida State University for their sponsoring a coffee break during the UHC. She closed by encouraging anyone who would like to provide support for the UHC to please contact her.

5.7 SCJ Editor - John Meyer

Southern Communication Journal

Published by the Southern States Communication Association

John Meyer, Editor

The University of Southern Mississippi

Speech Communication

118 College Drive # 5131

Hattiesburg, MS 39406

PHONE: 601.266.4280

FAX: 601.266.4275

To: Southern States Communication Association

From: John Meyer, Editor, *SCJ*

Re: Journal Report

Date: **March 26, 2007**

1. This school year the editorial assistant for *SCJ* is Janey Mattina, whose help I greatly appreciate. The two who preceded her (Matt Ramsey and Emily Cain) I am also grateful to for helping get the manuscript processing system running smoothly.
2. *SCJ* Vol. 72, Number 1 is currently being mailed out. It included a special section on the history of the Association written by members "who were there." These manuscripts came out of a panel last year in Dallas marking the 75th anniversary of the association, and I thought we needed some documentation of our history—especially in such informative and entertaining form—in our journal.
3. Manuscripts for *SCJ* Vol. 72, Number 2 have been sent to the publisher, Taylor and Francis.
4. For later this year, a special issue is being finalized on Communication and Commitment in Close, Personal Relationships, guest edited by Lynne Webb. The next year should see a special issue guest edited by Rob Ulmer and John Patton focusing on Communication Issues Related to Hurricane Crises. They report 28 submissions received for the special issue; a dramatic response.
5. Submission numbers are definitely up, but I continue to be excited by the variety of research areas and methods represented by submissions, and very grateful for the expert help of our very able and hard-working editorial board.
6. So far, I have received 299 manuscripts, including several forwarded from my predecessor Joy Hart that I counted as new manuscripts. That number does not include any manuscripts submitted for special issues or sections (67 so far, 24 of which have been accepted), or manuscripts submitted a second or third time as revised and resubmitted to me.

Manuscript disposition at this point may be classified as follows:

<u>Received</u>	<u>Not Accepted</u>	<u>Under Review/Possible Revision</u>	<u>Accepted</u>	<u>% Accepted</u>
299	229	40	30	10

John C. Meyer
Editor
John.Meyer@usm.edu

Charles Howard
Book Review Editor
choward@tarleton.edu

5.8 NCA Legislative Assembly Representatives – David Sutton, Deborah Hefferin, Monette Callaway-Ezell:

5.9 NCA Nominating Committee Representative - Kim Golombisky: No report

6. Standing Committee Reports

6.1 Committee on Committees – Charles Tardy: No report

6.2 Constitution – Norma Cook: Cook thanked her committee and presented the following Constitutional Amendments. All were moved, seconded and passed except the first amendment concerning Article IX, Section 1, Subsection C. The discussion to remove this amendment from consideration revolved around the need for a resource committee despite special funding. The Executive Council clarified the last amendment concerning Article VII, Section 1, Subsection A by stating that it was to begin in 2008.

Report of the 2007 SSCA

Constitution Committee

Norma Cook (Chair), Rick Bello, Rachel Holloway

Article IX, Section 1, Subsection C concerning appointment to the Resource Development Committee

At the end of Subsection C, add

- “5. Members of the Resource Development Committee shall be appointed on an ad hoc basis.”

In paragraph 3, delete “and” before “the Rose B. Johnson Award Committee,”

and insert following it “and the Resource Development Committee,” so that the paragraph reads:

- “3. Members of the Standing Committees and Awards Committees, except the Nominating Committee, the Committee on Committees, the Rose B. Johnson Award Committee, and the Resource Development Committee, shall be appointed for a term of three years, with staggered terms, shall be eligible for reappointment, and have the retiring member serve as chair.”

Article IV, Section 4, Subsection H concerning Executive Committee membership

Delete “and” before “the Immediate Past President”

and insert following it “, and the Chairperson of the Finance Committee” so that the Subsection reads:

- “H. The Executive Committee includes the President, the Vice President, the Vice President-Elect, the Executive Director, the Journal Editor, the Advertising Manager, the Immediate Past President, and the Chairperson of the Finance Committee.”

Article V, Section 1, Subsection A concerning Executive Council membership

Delete "and" before "Chairperson"

and insert "and members" after "Chairperson" and before "of the Finance Committee" so that the

Subsection reads:

- "A. President, Vice President, Vice President-Elect, Executive Director, Journal Editor, Advertising Manager, Chairperson and members of the Finance Committee."

Article IX, Section 1, Subsection A, Paragraph 3 concerning purposes of the Finance Committee

In the first sentence, insert after "present it to the Council for approval," the words "maintain a balanced budget," so that the sentence reads:

- "3. Finance Committee, whose purpose shall be to prepare an annual budget, present it to the Council for approval, maintain a balanced budget, and supervise its use."

Following the second sentence, insert "The Finance Committee must approve payment for non-budgeted items in excess of \$1000." so that sentences after the first read:

"The Executive Director shall be an ex-officio member of the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee must approve payment for non-budgeted items in excess of \$1000. The Finance Committee shall make recommendations on the investment of money raised through the payment of Life Membership dues."

Article IX, Section 1, Subsection B, Paragraph 5 concerning the SSCA Outstanding New Teacher Award

Delete "SSCA" and insert in its place "Dwight Freshley" so that the paragraph reads:

- "5. Dwight Freshley Outstanding New Teacher Award, whose purpose shall be to solicit nominees for the award, evaluate them based on the criteria established in the 'Guidelines for Awards,' and designate a recipient or recipients, unless none of the nominees meets the criteria."

Article VII, Section 1, Subsection A concerning selection of the Nominating Committee

In Subsection A, delete "A Nominating Committee shall be chosen in the following manner:" so that the Subsection reads:

"A. Method of Selection."

In Paragraph 1, delete "Each Division of the Association shall select one member to serve a two year term on the committee. The member selected may not have served on the Nominating Committee in the last two years. This selection may be done at the Division's convention business meeting or by mail ballot to members."

and insert in its place

"The Nominating Committee shall consist of the Immediate Past President of the Association, as chair, and the Immediate Past Chairs of all Divisions."

In Paragraph 2, delete "Terms shall be staggered so that half of the members are elected each year. In odd numbered years, members shall be selected from those divisions listed in Article X, Section 2, A, C, E, G, I, K, M, O, et cetera. In even numbered years, members shall be selected from those divisions listed in Article X, Section B, D, F, H, J, L, N, P, et cetera. The service of the two-year term shall begin in the year following election."

and insert in its place

"All members shall serve for one year."

In Paragraph 3, delete "The Immediate Past President shall chair the Nominating Committee. The Chair shall coordinate the committee's work."

In the remaining sentence in Paragraph 3, insert "Committee" after "The" and before "Chair"

and delete "must" and insert "shall" in its place

and delete "an update" and insert "a report" in its place so that the sentence (paragraph) reads:

"The Committee Chair or designee shall give a report to the Executive Council at its annual meeting during the National Communication Association convention."

6.3 Finance – Patricia Amason: Amason presented the budget and described the conference call that took place between the officers, the finance committee and the accountants that performed the annual review. Amason explained that Webb is looking into brokerage firm investments for some of the SSCA monies and will make recommendations to the Executive Council in November at the annual NCA meeting. Amason presented the following proposal that was moved and approved by the Executive Council.

Proposed Constitutional Amendment

Finance Committee, March 2007

Article IV. Officers

Section 4 Duties of Officers

D. The Executive Director shall perform all ordinary duties of the Secretary and Treasurer of the Association and of the Executive Council. As Treasurer, the Executive Director shall furnish a financial report at each annual convention. The Executive Director shall incorporate into the report a financial accounting covering all publications and the results of the official independent accounting review. The Executive Director shall notify the National Communication Association Executive Offices of the names and addresses of the newly elected High School, College, and Community/Two Year College Representatives to LC immediately after the close of the convention when they assume office. The Executive Director shall appoint a newsletter editor and a Webpage Editor. The Executive Director shall publish the SSCA newsletter and conduct Association elections in accordance with procedures outlined elsewhere in the Constitution. The Executive Director shall negotiate and sign all contracts on behalf of the Association, subject to approval of the Association.

The language in the constitution is vague as the word "annual" is not used in reference to the financial review, however it is implied.

Given this implication, the Finance Committee proposes the following Constitutional change clarifying the duties of the Executive Director:

D. The Executive Director shall perform all ordinary duties of the Secretary and Treasurer of the Association and of the Executive Council. As Treasurer, the Executive Director shall furnish a financial report at each annual convention. The Executive Director shall incorporate into the report a financial accounting covering all publications and the results of *an* official independent accounting review. *The Executive Director will arrange for an annual financial review of SSCA funds to be performed by a reputable certified public accounting firm. Within 30 days of receipt of the written report, members of the Finance Committee, the Executive Director, and Officers of SSCA will participate in a conference call with the reviewers once every five years beginning in the year 2011. The purpose of the call is not to provide a line-by-line summary of the report. Rather, the purpose of the call is to obtain additional information concerning revenues and expenses as needed or to seek advice concerning alternative funds management strategies.* The Executive Director shall notify the National Communication Association Executive Offices of the names and addresses of the newly elected High School, College, and Community/Two Year College Representatives to LC immediately after the close of the convention when they assume office. The Executive Director shall appoint a newsletter editor and a Webpage Editor. The Executive Director shall publish the SSCA newsletter and conduct Association elections in accordance with procedures outlined elsewhere in the Constitution. The Executive Director shall negotiate and sign all contracts on behalf of the Association, subject to approval of the Association.

6.4 Local Arrangements –William Thompson: No report

6.5 Minority Recruitment and Retention – Michael Eaves: The SSCA Minority Recruitment and Retention committee submits the following to the executive council as an FYI and possible endorsement, and/or modification, if the committee wishes to add or amend any of the items. While brief, I would like the report to be given at the meeting and put on the record. In terms of selection criteria, here are a few ideas:

- (a) SSCA University that has provided funding, beyond the general funds, for students/faculty of color to attend conferences**
- (b) SSCA University that has faculty members of color in leadership positions in SSCA (might assume that they are supported by way of release time or "professional" service credit)**
- (c) SSCA University that has supported research on topics of special interest to people of color (and/or that has resulted in a SSCA conference presentation)**
- (d) SSCA University that has highest number in attendance at SSCA conferences by faculty and students of color**

6.6 Publications – David Cratis Williams: Williams thanked his committee and reported that his committee had recommended Mary Stuckey as the SCJ Editor-Elect. The Executive Committee formally approved that recommendation. He also reported on his committee's deliberations concerning a second SSCA journal. Finally, Williams explained his committee's thoughts on changing the name of SCJ.

6.7 Resolutions – Karyn Brown: Brown asked that all resolutions be forwarded to her as soon as possible.

6.8 Resource Development – Frances Brandau-Brown: Brandau-Brown thanked her committee and explained that the Franklin Shirley Award would benefit from this year's Caring Connections donations. Prior to the convention CC had garnered \$1215 in donations. She thanked Todd Goen for his help with CC and Marilyn Young for her work. Young reported on fundraising efforts for the Theodore Clevenger, Jr. Undergraduate Honors Conference:

In November 2006 I met with Ruth Clevenger Reynolds to discuss fundraising possibilities for the Clevenger Undergraduate Honors Conference. We considered a number of ideas, and Ruth expressed her willingness to contribute to such an effort, both financially and in terms of time and effort. We talked about various possibilities for use of the funds and more or less settled on something that will defray costs for students. This might take the form of scholarships for a few students or something broader that will impact all attendees.

At NCA a group of SSCA members and leaders met to discuss issues and possibilities for UHC fundraising. What follows is a brief synopsis of the ideas that were introduced and discussed. Fundraising for the UHC is a major undertaking, as the amount needed will far exceed anything raised to date. In part this amount depends on what we want to do. For example, if the goal is to defray lodging costs for all participants without drawing down the principal, the goal of this effort should be \$400,000. If the goal is simply to provide a couple of scholarships that would pay the costs of two or three participants, the amount needed is much less—but the impact is also much less. The downside of the scholarship approach is that there is considerable paperwork associated with selecting recipients and there is little time. [One possibility would be to pay the way of the Shirley award winner—or something toward the costs of all finalists for this award].

These funds can be raised through donations from SSCA members, contributions from the Clevenger family, and donations from friends, students, and colleagues of Ted Clevenger. This might also be a sponsorship opportunity.

Some specific ideas for an SSCA commitment that were discussed included:

A \$5 surcharge for each member of SSCA upon renewal

A \$10 surcharge for each student attending UHC, earmarking the funds

Raising the registration fee for the UHC [it has remained the same since 1989] and earmarking the increase for the UHC endowment.

Introducing a one-day UHC registration fee for local students to attend only one day of the conference; these fees might be earmarked for the endowment.

Obviously, this will have to be a multi-year effort, and it may take a year or two to get this effort underway. However, there are some first steps, which I outline below, that can be taken. In the meantime, we need to decide on a specific goal for our endowment. At NCA, the consensus seemed to be to use the funds to defray housing costs for all participants; an interim goal might be to fund a few students. Alternately, we might decide to return all interest

to the account for a period of XX years in order to grow the endowment.

Earlier this year I met again with Ruth Reynolds to update her on our discussions. She was pleased at the results of the discussions at NCA and reiterated her willingness to participate by providing seed money and by covering some modest costs until the endowment is established.

Suggested Actions:

1. Establish an account for the UHC. Executive Director Emmett Winn has expressed reservations about establishing a separate account for the UHC. However, since we will be going outside the association to raise most of the funds, the existence of an account will help. Further, the Clevenger family prefers that a separate account be established. Once it is set up, Ruth Reynolds has agreed to contribute \$1000 in seed money. Her plan is to add funds as endowment milestones are reached.
2. Ask the membership to approve a \$5 surcharge on renewals for a period of X years to jumpstart fundraising for the UHC endowment.
3. Implement a \$10 surcharge on the UHC registration or raise the registration fee and earmark the additional collections for the UHC endowment.
4. Introduce a one-day UHC registration fee for local students to attend only one day of the conference, with the proceeds earmarked for the UHC endowment.
5. Add the UHC as an item for special donation on the membership renewal form along with the Awards
6. Empower the Resource Development Committee to engage in fundraising activities and to search for sponsors for the UHC.

Obviously, raising an endowment for the Undergraduate Honors Conference is an undertaking that is materially different than anything the Association has engaged in before. While I am willing to spearhead this effort and to act as liaison to the Clevenger family, I am not sure who has responsibility for decisions such as how much to set as a goal and how to use the funds once raised, given the number of possibilities. Certain things are the purview of the membership, such as dues increases and registration fee increases. But I am not sure that an individual should commit the Association to a fundraising effort such as we envision without some imprimatur from the Executive Council or other decision-making body.

6.9 Time and Place – Katherine Hendrix:

At the request of SSCA President, Dr. Charles Tardy, the members of the 2006-2007 SSCA Time & Place (T&P) Committee have chronicled our progress during the current academic year in order to develop a timeline that can function as a set of procedural guidelines for future use by members of this committee. The schedule we followed has worked quite effectively and we recommend the following:

August

Incoming T&P Chair is contacted by the SSCA President
--expectations reviewed, e.g., creating guidelines for future use
--committee members are identified and contact information is provided

The Executive Director provides examples of
--previous hotel breakouts and conference site needs
--4 year plan for convention cities
--contact information for the Conference Direct representative

The Executive Director also sets a deadline date for suggesting cities of interest to the Conference Direct representative

Typical Needs:

Late March - April conference dates

Guest Rooms: Tues 19-27; Wed 88-95; Thu 153-180; Fri 168-175; Sat 133-140; Sun Checkout
12-14 breakout rooms 2 presidential suites, 1 executive suite, and 1 banquet room

Negotiate food/beverage commitment

A/V equipment - coordinated with local events (local colleges and universities) - duty of the Executive Director

September

Time and Place committee members deliberate regarding cities of interest
3-4 cities are identified by each member

City Criteria:

Consult Convene Magazine

Consider current 4 year rotation

Avoid returning to the same region several years in a row

Ease of access

--central airport

--non and one-stop flights for members

Crime statistics

Past frequency of visits to the city

--strive for some new locations

Avoid invading the space of another region, e.g., Central

Narrow to Top 5 city choices

Contact Conference Direct rep for comparisons

Inform Exec Director and SSCA President of cities of interest

October

Committee Deliberations - Round 2

Hotel Selection:

Local Attractions and ease of access

--walking, trolley

Hotel meets guestroom and breakout room needs

--review the classroom, theater, boardroom, and banquet room formats

--we do NOT want to be in cramped session rooms; most rooms must seat
at least 30

Determine if we will be the large conference at the hotel or only one of
several (problematic)

Hotel is comfortable & reasonably priced
Hotel is in a safe location

Keep in mind 1-2 years ahead of assigned schedule for the next committee's consideration

Issues: It's difficult to find two hotels in the same city that meet our specifications; thereby, making negotiating prices a challenge

It's difficult finding facilities with the right # of COMFORTABLE breakout rooms that are not too small or far too large

Can disregard hotel costs (within reason) as this is negotiated by the Exec. Director
--if it's a large hotel (500+ guestrooms), it's doubtful that we will have negotiating power to lower room costs
Late October

Report top city selection and recommended hotels to the Executive Director and SSCA President
Overview handouts forwarded to the Executive Director for inclusion with Executive Committee Documents to be distributed at the National Communication Conference

November

Chair of Time & Place - presents report to SSCA Executive Committee during the NCA Conference

February or Early March

Site visit of hotels in the top ranked city recommended by members of the T&P Committee during the NCA convention

The Executive Director, Time & Place Chair, and one member of the T&P committee perform the site visit along with the Conference Direct representative
--airfare is provided by the SSCA organization; room and board is provided by the hotels under consideration

The Executive Director also confers with colleges and universities in the designated city to determine the level of participation in regards to local arrangements and events

April

The Chair of T & P presents the final results of any other project assigned by the SSCA President the previous August at Executive Council during the SSCA Conference. (The Chair is then presented with a free trip to Hawaii effective March 2007!)

The Executive Director reports on the selection of the city/hotel for the future conference site.

The position of Chair passes to the next member of the Time & Place Committee who then initiates planning the committee's work for the upcoming year.
--the SSCA President appoints a new committee member to replace the out-going Chair

Note: My thanks to Bob Denton and Susan Siltanen for their diligence and cooperative spirit as members of this year's Time & Place Committee.

7. **Division Reports:** The following division had reports: Gender Studies' Halvorson reported that Julia Wood is their spotlight scholar. Intercultural's Rucker reported that they received many interesting papers on a variety of subjects and asked for a clarification on the use of Divisional funds for giving top paper award winners cash awards. This matter was referred to the Finance Committee. Public Relations' Brunner thanked William Thompson and announced their divisional luncheon with IABC. RPA's Kuypers thanked the Vice Chair for a wonderful program. Southern Forensic's Hough reported that the division has increased its scope to insure that colleagues in the southern region can address issues related to forensics programs. Finally, Mass Communication's DeMars reported: The Mass Communication Division distributed two electronic newsletters to members since the 2006 convention--one preceding the 2007 Convention Call for Papers deadline and one preceding the 2007 Convention.

During the MCD Business meeting in 2006, Justin Young was elected as Secretary/Vice-President Elect and Karyn Brown was selected as Nominating Committee Representative. Brown resigned her position in the fall. The top faculty paper award to Bryan E. Denham and Richelle N. Jones. The top student paper award went to Eric Peterson. Wendy Hajjar suggested that an off-site location might be secured in Louisville for the production showcase for an evening or after-hours show. Tony DeMars suggested that he would like to see the conference spread the business meetings out to avoid the conflicts which arise when one person is a member of two divisions which are holding business meetings at the same time. In other suggestions for the Louisville conference, Hajjar suggested that the division solicit papers from the Central States organization. She also suggested that the division see if the host state gives credits to teachers who attend conferences. The Mass Communication Division has eight sessions plus the business meeting in Louisville. Submissions to MCD for Louisville: Received 15 faculty submissions and 7 graduate student submissions; Accepted 8 faculty papers and 4 grad student papers; There were 17 reviewers; There were 3 submissions for Production Showcase (all accepted, into one Showcase panel); There were 4 panel submissions.

8. **Unfinished Business:** none

9. **New Business**

9.1 Ad hoc committee on Association Awards Policies Report: Marilyn Young

Marilyn Young myoung@fsu.edu

Deborah Phillips dphillips@muskingum.edu

David Sutton suddoda@auburn.edu

Charge to the Committee:

1. Develop policy recommendation for the Executive Council regarding requirements for naming awards and other functions of SSCA and the relationship that naming has to an endowment for the award or function.

Examples: a. naming Association awards

b. Sponsors for keynote or plenary speakers

2. Develop policy recommendations for distributing funds to endowments from our general fund-raising efforts [such as Caring Connections].

In other words, how do we decide which award or function unrestricted gifts should be directed to.

3. Recommend a policy concerning the distribution of recognition [including funds] to award winners. This element of the charge was to be viewed expansively, to include recognition other than a financial award.

4. Develop a recommendation for other functions that should be endowed.

See #1 above for examples. Are there other functions that can be similarly endowed?

Committee discussion:

David Sutton and Marilyn Young met during NCA in November 2006 to discuss the charge and develop some preliminary recommendations. Here I organize our discussion according to the charge items listed above.

Charge number one – requirements for naming awards and other functions.

Generally awards have been named for Association members who have made significant contributions to the work of SSCA and who represent the qualities embodied in a particular award. Until recently there has been no thought of funding these awards except through occasional gifts. However, the awards represent a cost to the Association and naming has come to be seen as a means to off-set that cost and perhaps to provide a cash award to the recipient.

With the advent of Caring Connections it became possible to envision funding each of the awards at a sustainable level. This notion is developed further below. However, CC does not resolve the question of the relationship between naming and the endowment of an award, nor does it address potential sponsors—and funding—for other Association functions.

We discussed ways that endowing an award might be linked to naming. For example, should a certain level of monetary pledges be required before naming occurs?

We also discussed the possibility of re-naming or adding names to already named awards as a means to spur fund-raising. However, since this is the province of the RDC, we did not pursue this, and I mention it here for the benefit of the RDC.

We discussed other functions that might be named if sponsors can be found to support them. An obvious example is the keynote or plenary speaker. The difficulty we saw is that the structure for providing a primary convention speaker is idiosyncratic to the program planner. In some years we have had luncheon keynote speakers; President Tardy introduced the notion of plenary sessions with speakers. Our challenge is to find some policy language that will accommodate whatever structure is used in a given year while assuring continuity of funding before naming occurs. Are we thinking of corporate sponsors? Or will we model this on the Arnold Lecture at NCA and name it for a distinguished member of the Association? Will it become the XXX Plenary Address presented by ZZZ, using a sports model?

Other functions that might be named include the breakfast, perhaps some panels that are dedicated to a particular topic, receptions other than the Osborne reception [for example, if there is a reception following the plenary address].

Charge number two – distribution of funds to endowments:

The major sources of income to award endowments include Caring Connections, gifts that accompany membership renewals, and occasional gifts from the membership or others. Some of these gifts are targeted, some are not. Our discussion centered around how to decide which endowments to focus on at a given moment. Our understanding is that the Resource Development Committee selects the award that is closest to reaching the \$5000 mark and dedicates the funds raised through CC to that endowment.

Charge number three – policy recommendations for recognition of award winners:

The obvious question here is that of the cash award. The problem is that in most of our awards we are nowhere near having sufficient funds in the endowment to support a cash outlay for recognition. And, in some cases, such as the Osborne award, the principal benefactor does not wish for the recognition to have a cash award. Thus, the need for a policy is obvious. Our discussion centered around whether and when to include cash award and, if one is included, how it should be distributed, so that a portion of the interest is retained in the endowment to grow the

principal. Emmett Winn and Ken Cissna provided some valuable information in this regard in an email exchange prior to NCA. The consensus seemed to be that where a cash award is part of the recognition a level amount should be identified to compensate for variations in interest rates.

Charge number four -- other Association functions that could be endowed/named?

This question is limited only by our imagination and our willingness to seek sponsors. Many ideas came to mind, but at the root of this question is a more philosophical one that has recently been debated on CRTNET at some length. Depending on the nature of the sponsors we would seek for naming opportunities, there are any number of possibilities. However, we decided that the fundamental question was beyond our purview until a general discussion is held by the Executive Council and/or the membership.

Recommendations:

1. The Ad Hoc Committee on Awards Policies recommends the following with respect to naming awards:
 - a. The group or individual seeking to name an award for someone is responsible for initiating the process. When \$5000* has been pledged, the group or individual may petition the Executive Council, which, if it approves of the naming, will ask the Executive Director to open an account.
 - b. When the \$5000 has been deposited, naming of the award will occur.
2. The Ad Hoc Committee on Awards Policies recommends the following with respect to naming other functions.
 - a. At each SSCA Convention the Resource Development Committee shall consult with the primary program planner for the next year's convention to identify Association functions at the convention that might be sponsored by outside entities. (Examples: Plenary Sessions [speakers] or Keynote Speakers; receptions. One type of event that might have a sponsor is a special panel that honors a scholar or other individual. An example would be the Gender Scholar of the Year, a panel and reception planned by the Gender Studies division.) Once the events are identified, the RDC will work with the primary program planner to recruit sponsors for these events. We envision that some events will have a single sponsor while others might have multiple sponsors.
 - b. The Association shall create a named lecture similar to the Arnold Lecture at NCA; this lecture could be either the luncheon Keynote address or other address such as a plenary speaker. Permanent sponsorship shall be sought for this lecture, probably from a publishing company. The RDC and the Executive Committee shall consider possible names and sponsors for this lecture series.
 - c. Spotlight Panels represent another possibility for naming and sponsorship. Each division shall identify a major scholar in that area who has not otherwise been so honored by the Association and for whom the panel might be named [e.g., "The XXX Spotlight Panel featuring ZZZ"]; each division shall then work with the RDC for funding and sponsorship. Spotlight panels, even though named, would not have to be offered at each convention.
3. The Ad Hoc Committee on Awards Policies recommends the following with respect to distribution of funds from general (unrestricted) fund-raising efforts such as Caring Connections:
 - a. In general, unrestricted gifts shall be directed to the endowment that is closest to reaching its funding goal. Each year the RDC shall identify the entity or activity that is closest to the goal and commit unrestricted gifts to that fund. This would essentially institutionalize the current practice of the RDC with respect to Caring Connections.
 - b. In specific, Caring Connections shall be identified as the fundraising arm for SSCA awards that are not otherwise funded. Once all Association awards are funded at a fully sustainable level [now thought to be \$10,000], Caring Connection funds can be directed toward other Association needs.
4. The Ad Hoc Committee on Awards Policies recommends the following with respect to distribution of recognition [including funds] to award winners:
 - a. No cash distribution will be made from award funds that total less than \$10,000. No matter how great the dollar value of the interest that accrues to an award fund in any fiscal year, no more than 60 per cent of that dollar value shall be transferred to the general revenues of the Association to support award recipients. At least 40 per cent of the dollar value of the interest that accrues to an award fund in any fiscal year shall be retained in that fund.
 - b. If an award is funded at a level that will support a cash distribution and such distribution is appropriate for that award, the following policy shall obtain: Only monies derived from interest on the endowment shall be distributed; the principal shall remain intact. Thus, a cash award will not be made until the funds have been in place and accruing interest for at least one year. Of the monies that are available from accrued interest, only a reasonable portion will be awarded to the recipient, whether as a cash award or in the form of a plaque and luncheon ticket; the remainder will be returned to the fund to grow the endowment. The breakdown of this distribution shall be according to current fund management best practices. Distributions of interest from award funds shall conform to the following guidelines:
 - i. < \$5000 – all interest shall be returned to the award fund
 - ii. \$5000 - \$9999 – half of interest earned shall be returned to the award fund; half of interest earned shall be applied to defray the cost to the Association of the plaque and luncheon ticket.
 - iii. \$10,000 - \$14,999– A cash award of \$150 may be distributed to the award recipient, if appropriate for that award; any remainder of the 60% of interest distributed to general revenue shall be used to defray costs of the plaque and luncheon.

iv. For awards funded at \$15,000 or above any cash award shall increase in increments of \$50 for each additional \$5000 in the award fund. Thus, at the \$15,000 level, \$200 may be distributed to the award recipient and so on. Any remainder of the 60% of interest distributed to general revenue shall be used to defray costs of the plaque and luncheon.

v. The Janice Rushing Early Career Research Award shall be treated as a separate case. A minimum cash award of \$1000 shall be distributed to the award recipient, beginning with the 2008 Convention. In years when the interest rate exceeds 3%, the cash award shall total 55% of the interest earned; five per cent shall be retained in general revenue to defray the cost of the plaque and luncheon; forty per cent shall be returned to the endowment.

c. Whether or not there is a financial component to the award, other recognition shall be provided. We recommend that, in addition to the traditional plaque and luncheon ticket, there be a special panel every 3 years for each award. The panelists will consist of the award winners for the previous 3 years; panels will be staggered so that there are at least two award panels each year.

d. For the Rose B. Johnson Article Award we recommend an additional recognition in the form of a hard cover edition of the SCJ issue in which the essay appeared.

9.2 Ad hoc Committee on Electronic Submissions Report: Joy Hart

The committee is charged with exploring electronic submission services for SSCA. In our November report, we summarized information on potential vendors, services, and benefits and limitations. In this report, we discuss SSCA member views.

Review of information from November report

NCA, ICA, and AEJMC use All Academic. None of the regional associations in communication (i.e., CSCA, ECA, or WSCA) currently uses an online submission service and none reported plans to begin doing so. However, many divisions within such associations do allow/encourage online submission by attachment.

If we pursue a contract with an electronic submission service, the following recommendations were made: (1) any contract should include technical support services for both submitting and reviewing and (2) an association group (e.g., task force) needs to be composed to work with the vendor.

Member input

Seventy-two SSCA members responded to an email survey in early March. A detailed report of results is available from the committee. In short, 87% of respondents supported moving to an electronic submission system. Although nearly one-fourth (24.3%) would not support a dues increase for such a system, nearly 70% would support a dues increase (41.4% up to \$10, 22.9% up to \$20, and 4.3% up to \$30). Slightly more than 40% indicated that such a submission service would not influence their decision to submit manuscripts to SSCA, but just over 14% said that they would be much more likely to submit and slightly more than 36% said that they would be somewhat more likely to submit. Members also made open-ended comments in support of and against using an electronic submission service. Comments in support of such a system focused on efficiency—saving time and money. Comments opposing such a system stressed that submitting through email works fine and that SSCA is small enough that a submission service isn't needed.

The committee is distributing a paper survey at the convention and will report separately on these findings.

The SSCA Ad Hoc Committee on Electronic Submission has been asked to evaluate member interest in using some form of electronic submissions for papers to our future conventions. As part of this process, we ask that you take a couple of minutes to give us your opinions and answer the following questions. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Preliminary Results: N = 70*

Notes

* A total of 72 responses were obtained. However, two of the respondents gave comments only and did not answer the questionnaire. Their comments are included in the comments section below, but were not included in the statistical count. Some questions have fewer than 70 responses, due to non-response on those questions.

* Question 6 has more than 70 responses because many of the respondents checked multiple boxes. Percentages are based on 69 completed responses.

Results

Would you like to see SSCA move to an electronic system for submitting papers and proposals to the annual SSCA convention?

Yes	61 (87.1%)
No	7 (10.0%)
Unsure	1 (1.4%)
Maybe	1 (1.4%)

To what extent would you support the adoption of such an electronic submission system?

strongly support	47 (67.1%)
support	14 (20.0%)

unsure 2 (2.9%)
oppose 5 (7.1%)
strongly oppose 2 (2.9%)

Would you be willing to pay an increase in SSCA membership dues for a new system?

Median: \$7.33

no 17 (24.3%)
yes, if less than \$10 29 (41.4%)
yes, if less than \$20 16 (22.9%)
yes, if less than \$30 3 (4.3%)
unsure 5 (7.1%)

Have you submitted conference papers or proposals to SSCA before?

Yes 66 (95.7%)
No 3 (4.3%)

Have you submitted conference papers or proposals to other associations through an electronic submission process?

Yes 63 (91.3%)
No 6 (8.7%)

If yes, were these submitted to

NCA	52	82.5%
ICA	12	17.4%
Other regional association	7	10.1%
other	17	17.4%

If you used electronic submissions in the past, how would you rate your overall experience with that submission process?

excellent	33	47.8%
good	23	33.3%
average	5	7.2%
only fair	2	2.9%
poor	5	7.2%
unsure	1	1.4%

Would using an electronic submission system make you more or less likely to submit papers to SSCA?

much more likely	10	14.5%
somewhat more likely	25	36.2%
somewhat less likely	2	2.9%
much less likely	3	4.3%
no difference	29	42.0%

Have you reviewed conference papers electronically before?

Yes 41 61.2%
No 26 38.8%

If yes, where?

NCA	27 (39.1%)
ICA	5 (7.2%)
Other regional association	6 (8.7%)
other	11 (15.9%)

If yes, how would you rate your overall experience with electronic paper reviewing?

excellent	17 (42.5%)
good	14 (35.0%)

average	5 (12.5%)
only fair	1 (2.5%)
poor	3 (7.5%)

Please provide any feedback you have for SSCA leadership regarding the adoption of electronic submissions.

**COMMENTS
SUPPORTING**

After the glitches were worked out electronic submissions have worked well for NCA and ICA. This would be worth pursuing.

The Mass Communication Division of SSCA accepts electronic submissions. I planned this year's conference for the division, and having electronic submissions made the job go more quickly and efficiently. I am very much in favor of other divisions also accepting electronic submissions.

Inevitably, there are always "issues" related to new technology. Perhaps because of the relatively larger number of people involved, submitters seem to encounter more problems than reviewers. In my experience with electronic submission processes, clear communication from the parent organization can help to alleviate user-generated errors and general distress. The electronic review process seems to benefit planners and reviewers somewhat more than submitters, but I believe it helps everyone in the long run. As a planner, I appreciate the electronic system's ability to help me track, communicate, organize, and project a program. For these reasons, I am in favor of adopting a centralized electronic submission process for SSCA.

Electronic submissions of papers or e-submissions constitute the new reality of international conferencing. My organization, the International Association for Intercultural Communication Studies (IAICS), for example, has over 600 people attending a conference in Beijing in China in June. All of the submissions are e-submissions.

My experience has revealed that there is still some work needed to help promote the blind review of electronic submissions, but this should not be a major barrier. It works most of the time. I believe most of the problems I experienced were due to inexperience with the systems and that the pros outweigh the cons.

The cost is currently borne by the institutions of the vice-chairs and the reviewers. It makes sense to "spread" the cost over the membership but I don't think that it worth a great expense. An alternative is to e-mail submissions to the vice chair who e-mails them to reviewers.

Adoption of electronic submissions would streamline the process and place the burden more on IT departments/personnel. However problems might occur for those living in certain socioeconomic areas in which electronic submission may not be the best bet (lower income households or rural areas). I wonder if there could be exceptions to those individuals with certain needs.

It is time SSCA moved out of the 1800's. It is time to update and that includes electronic submission.

This change seems like a no-brainer to me. It saves so much time and money and accelerates the process, potentially allowing for a later submission date or more time to make travel plans.

I am in favor of electronic submissions. I think the reviewing process is much easier.

When considering the question of a dues increase, I hope folks will think about the amount of money we collectively spend FedExing materials at the last minute to meet deadlines. And anyone who has ever been a program planner should be urged to remember the mess created by having all that paper come in, multiple copies of every submission (enough to make anyone with any environmental conscience blush), all of which had to be resorted and reshipped from the program planner to reviewers. Even though other associations have hit a few bumps and potholes with electronic submissions and reviews, some of them have been ironed out for us by our predecessors. It will only get better. There are really no good reasons to trying to maintain our system of hardcopy submissions.

It doesn't have to be a formal electronic submission such as All-Academics with NCA. Just being able to send them through email is fine. Last year my division at SSCA required hard copies that had to be mailed three days in advance (to make sure they arrived on time). This was annoying. This year they allowed email attachments and it was much easier. While I don't like to mail hard copies, I would do it again. I really don't want to pay extra fees. If the choice is paying a fee OR mailing hard copies I'd reluctantly choose mailing hard copies.

Seems a simple enough process--papers less likely to be misplaced, lost in the mail, etc. (things I've experienced and heard about from colleagues). We'll push deadlines dangerously close, of course...but seems, again,

to work as well or better than hard copies sent via mail. I'm not sure why we wouldn't want to go to something like this (and why it would cost anything more to do so ...??).

Some SSCA divisions have done a low-tech version of online submission in which we received and responded to electronic copies. Also, I had a positive experience with a small conference several years ago

I'd love to see this move. It only makes sense to get in line with the national organization. It helps that most people are now familiar with the process.

I think due to convenience and "progress" this is coming--I do think we need to be careful that such a system is not overly complicated and expensive for our needs, but I can sure see if done right it can save labor for conference planners.

Why would it cost more?

It is less expensive, more convenient, and more environmentally friendly to submit and review electronically. Also (and this may seem silly), it gives submitters a few more days on the deadline since they do not have to send an essay several days in advance. I have had few troubles submitting or reviewing electronically and those were just problems with the computer systems that were fixed quickly without causing me much stress. Thanks for pursuing this avenue!

It's unclear whether you're talking about a dedicated, electronic submission clearing house-type system, or just any type of electronic submissions. We use email-based electronic submissions in several SSCA divisions. I've used both e-mail and clearing house-type submissions, and they both seem to work pretty well. E-mail submissions have worked so well in my experience that I would not support changing from e-mail submissions to a clearing house-type system if there were any cost increase associated with the change.

The /only /negative part of my experience with SSCA in 2006 was the submissions process. One division planner only accepted postal mail submission of hard copies, and my paper didn't make it by the deadline, even though I overnighted it three days in advance. That paper went on to be a top four paper at NCA. This is a long overdue change.

I think that electronic submission makes sense--e-mail attachments if nothing else.

OPPOSING

The technology is there, but the people are not ready yet. Past experience as a reviewer was poor (horrible would be a better term!). To put it simply, raising dues to do this makes no sense. It should reduce expense, not increase it. But even that is not likely to benefit our organization or our members.

Unless the software interface is much more user friendly, this could be another mess a la "All Academic."

What we have is simple and works great. We are small enough that this isn't needed. For NCA, okay, but for us, surely not. To be absolutely frank, I have declined to review for NCA recently because the electronic submission process puts too much headache on the reviewers – as I don't want to read the papers on the screen, this requires that I, as a reviewer, print them all. No way I'm going to do that.

I've served as a program planner for SSCA. Based on that experience, I really don't see a need for electronic submissions. The process of submitting via email worked fine for my planning efforts.

I oppose this. My experience with it with NCA has not been good. I think it is okay if the reviewers want to accept papers as email attachments if this as an option in addition to paper submission.

9.3 Ad hoc Committee on Research Support Guidelines Report: Andy King

Committee Report on Recognition and Awards

Andy King, Ken. Zagacki, Victoria Gallagher, and Clarke Rountree

Our Charge: This committee was asked to design a policy for SSCA to award small stipends to promising grad students and young faculty. The idea is that even small stipends and awards might help young faculty build careers, impress deans, gain tenure and give vita what McCrosskey has called the spangle effect.

Selection: Our mode is simple. Departments or individuals nominate gifted graduate students or deserving young faculty. A panel appointed by the president or first vice president of SSCA. Young faculty will receive a plaque, waiver of fees at the Convention and a maximum of \$500. Graduate students will receive a plaque, and a waive of fees at the Convention

Method: Professors will nominate students or tenure track faculty. Along with nomination contact information will be required. This will include vita, status information and a letter explaining academic promise

Decision: The committee (in consultation with the Vice president) will decide on one graduate student and one tenure track faculty member. from the pool of submissions.

Name: The Graduate Award should be called *Academic Promise Award* and the Faculty Award should be called *Early Achievement Award*.

10. Announcements and Adjournment: Tardy adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m. on March 29.