

Instructional Communication Interest Group
2023 Business Meeting Minutes
April 1, 2023, 1:45 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

In attendance: James Baker, Dana Borzea, Lauren Fellers, Maria Hannah, Daniel Mansson, Scott Myers, Sara Pitts, Sara Weintraub

1. Call to order from James Baker
2. Approval of minutes (motion from Daniel Mansson and seconded by Sara Pitts)
3. Officer Reports
 - a. From the Chair (James Baker):
 - i. Submission statistics: We were given eight slots as a division for this convention. Of the 12 papers that were submitted + 1 paper that was transferred into the division from the Community College Division, only nine papers were accepted. One paper was rejected. Two papers were transferred to G.I.F.T.S. Therefore, three paper sessions were organized (with three papers presented per session). A total of 7 panel/roundtable sessions were submitted to the division. Two panels were submitted that were thought to be too similar (with the same authors/contributors), so only one was accepted. One other submitted panel was declined. The division had a total of 5 panels/roundtables accepted.
 - ii. At previous ECA conventions, Zac Johnson has suggested that the business meeting not be at 8:00 a.m. James said that we are moving in the right direction as the business meeting this year was scheduled to begin at 1:45 p.m. on a Saturday. With that said, James stated that the business meeting should ideally take place right after the top paper panel for the interest group. This year, the business meeting directly preceded the top paper panel.
 - iii. James expressed gratitude to reviewers, chairs, and respondents. James gave a special shoutout to those who stepped in to fill a last-minute need (e.g., Sara Pitts, Stephen Kromka, & Jordan Atkinson).
 - iv. Award Presentations (top papers):
 1. ““You are Not Excused”: Using Psychological Reactance Theory to Investigate Late Work Policies and Instructional Dissent in the Classroom” Rebekah Chiasson, West Virginia University; Matthew M. Martin, West Virginia University
 2. “Affective and Interest Consequences of Lecture Misbehaviors for Students with Mastery Goals.” Alan K. Goodboy, West Virginia University; San Bolkan, California State University – Long Beach;

Matt Shin, West Virginia University; Rebekah Chiasson, West Virginia University

3. “Undergraduates’ perceptions of inclusivity in higher education classrooms” Victoria McDermott, University of Alaska Fairbanks; Shawna Dias, University of Maryland; Lindsey B. Anderson, University of Maryland
- v. James highly recommended that people attend the top paper panel after the business meeting.
- vi. James shared that Jennifer Waldeck (Convention Program Planner) offered our interest group the opportunity to do an extra panel surrounding the theme of harboring innovation. James said that he sent out an email about it and received no responses. Therefore, we (as an interest group) did not take advantage of this opportunity. To make sure that we continue to receive as many slots as possible to spotlight instructional communication work at future conventions, James asked the interest group to think carefully before not taking advantage of similar opportunities to fill more slots at ECA in the future, especially when we are given the opportunity to do so by leadership.
- vii. Daniel brought up issues related to blind review. Specifically, Daniel mentioned that the panel submissions typically include the names of all those who would participate in a proposed panel (and these names are then visible to reviewers).
- viii. James added that the limitations of Attendee Interactive make it impossible for the chair to edit submissions to make them suitable for blind review before sending them to reviewers through the system.
- ix. In trying to make the instructions for panel submissions to the interest group clearer to allow for blind review, James suggested that it might be helpful to add examples to the call demonstrating how it has been done well in the past (e.g., “Speaker 1 on the panel would...”).
- x. Sara Pitts was made aware that the rubric should ask reviewers to assign a score to submissions because reviewers cannot properly rank the submissions they have been assigned to review without also seeing all of the other submissions.
- xi. Scott Myers suggested that we no longer require that people include a “Statement of Professional Responsibility” when submitting to the interest group because sometimes people realize after submitting that they cannot attend the convention based on valid, unforeseen circumstance.
- xii. The group lamented some of the limitations of Attendee Interactive.
- xiii. Scott asked if ECA is going to continue to use Attendee Interactive in the future.

- xiv. Sara Pitts confirmed that at least for the next year (i.e., 2024), we will be using Attendee Interactive as the contract has already been signed.
 - b. From the Vice-Chair (Sara Pitts):
 - i. ECA 2024 Convention is scheduled for March 20th to March 24th at the Hyatt Regency Boston/Cambridge in Cambridge, Massachusetts.
 - ii. Hotel rooms are estimated to cost \$229 per night.
 - iii. Sara emphasized that the ECA submission deadline is much earlier this year: September 18th, 2023. The goal is to have emails detailing acceptances/rejections sent out and a full program available during the first week of January. Hopefully, having this information earlier will be helpful for people trying to apply for and secure travel funding.
 - iv. These changes will not affect undergraduates. At the moment, the deadline for their submissions is December 1st, 2023; however, Scott suggested it be moved to Friday, December 15th, 2023. This would allow undergraduates to have more time to complete their projects before submitting them. The point was made that reviewers would not even be likely to look at those submissions until after the fall semester ended anyway.
 - v. Sara added that it is helpful for planning when individuals pre-register for the convention.
 - vi. Sara said that they are thinking about doing a session about grant funding at next year's convention.
 - vii. The theme of next year's convention will be "Currents." There will also be a community college pre-conference.
 - c. From the Executive Council Representative (Kerry Byrnes-Loinette):
 - i. Kerry was not present at the business meeting (potentially had been double-booked). Therefore, there was nothing to report.
4. New Business
- a. Nominations and/or elections
 - i. Vice Chair Elect (2025 Interest Group Planner):
 - 1. Sara Pitts nominated Maria Hannah. Scott seconded the nomination. The group voted in favor of Maria becoming the vice chair elect.
 - ii. Secretary:
 - 1. The secretary (Lauren Fellers) still has one more year left in that service role.
 - iii. Executive Council Representative:
 - 1. Scott nominated Dana Borzea. Sara Pitts seconded the nomination. The group voted in favor of Dana becoming the next executive

council representative. Service in this role is scheduled to begin on a Sunday in 2024.

iv. Other volunteer roles (e.g., reviewers, respondents, chairs)

1. Sara Pitts will send out a link to a survey that people can fill out if they would like to indicate their interest in serving in other roles for the interest group in the upcoming year (e.g., reviewers, respondents, chairs).

5. Announcements & Discussion

- a. Scott asked the group which instructional communication panels they thought were well-attended this year. The group agreed that panels with a practical/teaching focus were more popular than those that with a theory/research focus. Perhaps we have more panels with a practical/teaching focus in the future (stated by Scott and Sara Pitts).
 - b. James questioned if the way we do paper panels is the best way to go moving forward (i.e., each speaker has 15 minutes to describe their research and then we hear from a respondent). Perhaps we can shake things up in the future (e.g., get rid of the respondent, have those with a competitive paper also provide audience members with a handout listing practical implications from their research).
 - c. Lauren pointed out that we talk about how helpful active learning is in our classrooms, yet we don't seem to integrate active learning into panels at ECA. Perhaps presenters could facilitate activities during panels more often.
 - d. Daniel liked the idea of active learning in panels. Perhaps we spend five minutes at the beginning of a panel introducing a problem we face as instructors and then spend the rest of the time working through potential research-based solutions (i.e., encouraging audience participation throughout). We could even create handouts featuring practical tips and tricks.
 - e. Scott suggested that Sara Pitts reach out to specific people to speak during panels (e.g., experts in each area of instructional communication to speak on their areas of expertise, instructors to share insights from their own failures in the classroom).
 - f. Maria suggested that we create a shared Google Drive folder with resources that are created/presented by members of our interest group at ECA that individuals can then access as needed in the future.
 - g. Scott encouraged Sara to balance the suggestions we brainstorm at the business meeting with what Sara thinks is best as the one who is actually doing the planning for the interest group in 2024.
 - h. James passed the gavel to Sara Pitts who is now the chair of the interest group. Sara thanked James for his service to the interest group.
6. Meeting Adjourned
- a. Motion to adjourn by Sara Pitts, seconded by Lauren