Call to Order
Mark Aakhus called meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

Barbara Zilizer (President Elect Select) Visit to the Business Meeting
A. Next year’s conference will be in Chicago, May 21-25. There will be an excellent rate for rooms ($109).
B. The conference theme is: Key Words in Communication. One purpose of the conference will be to develop a collective exercise around key words, ideas, and frames that have been central to communication and have disappeared. Ways to access this theme are through: theme sessions and cross-minute programming or to put together panels to bring together people from at least 4 different divisions.
C. On a pragmatic level, the conference will also strive to make connections outside of the hotel site. For example, there will be an orientation session of neighborhoods in Chicago.
D. When submitting papers, potential conference attendees should register to review for division. Participants can also volunteer to review for theme session. The submission deadline is Nov. 3rd. However, it is recommended that participants submit early!

Approval of Minutes from San Francisco, 2007
A. Minutes from the ICA 2007 business meeting in Dresden were distributed. Karen Tracy moved to approve minutes. Eric Kramer seconded. Motion approved.
B. If anyone wants a copy of those minutes, contact Theresa Castor castor@uwp.edu.

Reports
A. ICA
   1. Program 2008
      a. About 4200 members; 1/3 of membership consists of graduate students
      b. 2,000 participants
      c. 41% acceptance rate
      d. 474 final sessions
      e. 2 plenary sessions
      f. 2 Fellow Sessions
      g. 13 theme sessions
      h. 8 preconferences, with 1 held at the HEC (at the University of Montréal) honoring Jim Taylor,
      i. 89 Travel Grant Applications (88 awarded, 1 did not have paper)
      j. 25 or so Parallel Sessions per time slot
      k. Scholar to Scholar Interactive Paper/Poster Sessions
      l. 9-6 Schedule
      m. CyberCafe (refreshments 10 a.m. and 2 p.m)
      n. PowerPoint in each Room
o. All association mini-plenary
p. 1,777 total Registration as of 5/22 (about 200 on site, compared to 1872 at the San Francisco conference).

2. Upcoming Conventions
   a. 2008: Chicago, IL (May 21-25, 2008)
   b. Theme: Keywords in Communication (– to get beyond comfort zone conceptually and pragmatically – a slightly meta-dimension to theme sessions – take stock of field)
   c. Hotel: Marriot Downtown $109/night ((massive renovation, boutique hotel, conversational spaces), located in the middle of the Magnificent Mile, more central/connected). All meeting rooms will have LCD and overhead projectors
   d. New Features: (1) Cross Unit programming instead of a one of the traditional plenary sessions (e.g., panels that bring together 4 people from 4 different divisions or interests groups). (2) Reach out to neighborhoods, offer something for neighborhoods near site or near L. (3) Additional working ideas for conference: get a keynote speaker such as Anthony Giddens, Umberto Eco, or Noam Chomsky; Architectural tour by boat, Millennium park.
   e. Future Sites:
      i. 2010, early June – Singapore
         1. Working on a financial deal that works for members. Aim to get room rates down, if not then use other money to reduce registration fee and increase support for traveling. Looking to offset hotel rate and airfare by, for example, including lunches and dinners.
         2. Rates comparable to Montreal originally USD160/night. Committed to Singapore (backup Osaka-little cheaper as of now, Melbourne-expensive)
      ii. 2011 – Boston
      iii. 2012 – Phoenix
      iv. 2013 – Europe
         1. There was a request for suggestions on where to go and where to avoid.
            a. Possibilities/suggestions included: Warsaw (affordable meeting facility); Milan; Barcelona.

3. Budget
   a. ICA 08 Budget approved and in good shape. Lost $45,000 in investments, but there is a good supply of cash on hand. The ICA building is $3M, and $1.9M is still owed. There are enough assets and cash to carry for 1 year without borrowing against the building.
4. Reorganizing/Renaming Divisions and Interest Groups
   a. “Committee on Divisions/Interests Groups”
      i. One proposal is to reconfigure/realign the divisions/interest
groups naming but not much will to take that on. There will
likely be a larger group than the task force to explore this issue.
      ii. One suggestion of the committee is to leave the divisions as
they currently stand, but recommend future self-studies by
divisions and interest groups to examine divisions/charter
statements and for membership to look for possible revisions or
for fusions with possible external studies.
   b. Proposal to change the petition for new interest group formation so
that other existing divisions/interest groups have some input of some
sort. Board voted to change current rules for interest group formation.
Now any proposed interest group must now have 1% signatories, make
an impact statement, and are strongly suggested to consult with other
relevant groups.

5. All Academic – Recent CRTNET posts
   a. Post paper on AllAcademic with an optin/optout licensing agreement
to go into the archive.
   b. There is no charge for the papers ($7) that changed this year. If people
didn’t see this information, then their ‘cookies’ were set so that they
were looking at old pages, not the changed ones. 27% of papers
submitted opted out (as proof that the ‘cookies’ were misleading
individuals regarding licensing agreement). ICA will change so that
you have to select yes/no before moving on to next part of submission.

B. LSI Report about this Year’s Convention
   1. Submissions and Panels:
      a. 10 sessions were programmed, see Table Panels Allocated by ICA
      b. 4 papers were programmed in the Plenary Poster Session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panels Allocated by ICA 2005-2008</th>
<th>08 Montreal</th>
<th>07 San Francisco</th>
<th>06 Dresden</th>
<th>05 NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Meeting</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Panels</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Paper Panels</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Submission Acceptance/Rejection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Acceptance/Rejection 2008*</th>
<th>LSI/ICA08, Montreal</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Acc/Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08 Montreal</td>
<td>07 San Francisco</td>
<td>06 Dresden</td>
<td>05 NYC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extended Abstract | 06 | 25 | 31 | 19.4%
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Paper | 29 | 25 | 54 | 53.7%
Panel | 01 | 00 | 01 | 100%
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
| 36 | 50 | 86 | 41.8%

Submission Acceptance/Rejection 2007*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSI/ICA07, San Fran.</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Acc/Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Abstract</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt;1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Acceptance Rate for 2006 was 73%, 2005 was 78%)

3. Reviewers:
   a. 2008 Reviewers

| Agne, Robert | Benjamin, Jim | Chang, Yanrong | Cheung, Ming | Cody, Susan | Haspell, Kathleen | Heinz, Bettina | Kendrick, William | Kline, Susan | Lagerwerf, Luuk | Lee, Ee Lin | Markman, Kris | Mokros, Harty | Moore, Jessica | Morrison, Jody | Pollach, Irene | Ray, George | Rossman, Liliana | Sanders, Robert | Stapleton, Karyn | Stewart, Craig | Swieringa, Robert | Witteborn, Saskia |

Round of applause and appreciation to reviewers!

4. Reviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewers/Reviewing</th>
<th>LSI/ICA 08</th>
<th>LIS/ICA 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Items to Review (Ext Abst, Papers, Panels)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Reviewers</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Reviews per item</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of items per Reviewer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In 08 two reviewers failed to complete any reviews, these were done by the division chair
** In 07 approximately 15 people promised to review, 6 of those declined when it came time to review, the extra reviewing had to be divided up among remaining reviewers, extra reviewers had to be found, and the division chair made up remaining slack in
reviewing. The new reviewer management options in the online review system help overcome some of the problems experienced in 07.

- There were question regarding whether to go to more reviewers per paper to get three reviews per paper rather than 2. Individuals can contribute their names to the allacademic site so that the division can get reviewers. Potential reviewers can specify key terms.
- Now, there may be more reviewers, but the cost is that there are reviewers who are not known by chair.

5. Awards and Honors
   a. Student Award: The award for the highest ranked competitive paper authored solely by a student was given to James McDonald, University of Montreal.
   b. The top paper award recipients are:
      i. The Clashes of Expert and Laymen Talk: Constructing Meanings in Interpreter-Mediated Medical Encounters
         1. Elaine Hsieh, University of Oklahoma; Eric Kramer, U of Oklahoma
      ii. When Are Persons "White"? The Organization of Racial Categories in Talk-in-Interaction
         1. Gene Lerner, U of California - Santa Barbara; Kevin Whitehead, U of California - Santa Barbara
      iii. 'Occasional' Drinking: Some uses of a non-standard temporal metric.
         1. Timothy Halkowski, U of Albany - SUNY
   c. Student Cash Awards (drawn from $300 LSI and $300 match by ICA)
      i. James McDonald, University of Montreal, Top Student Paper
      ii. Kevin Whitehead, UC-Santa Barbara, Top 3 paper
      iii. David Huffaker, Northwestern University
      iv. Armineh Nourbakhsh, Nanyang Technological University
   d. Three individuals had their conference fees waived:
      i. Miriam Greenfeld, Rutgers University
      ii. Liliya Karimova, University of Massachusetts-Amherst
      iii. Armineh Nourbakhsh, Nanyang Technological University

6. Budget
   a. 2008 budget: $822 (2007 = $1,440.00)
      i. Expenses
         1. Outstanding Student Award: $300
2. Plaques: $300
3. LSI Reception: $222

ii. What is left: $0.00

b. Why was the budget apparently lower in 2008 than 2007?
   i. We did not exhaust our budget in Dresden, so it rolled over to 2007. It had been our understanding that we needed to spend the funds but upon clarification with Michael Haley, that’s not the case. And, indeed, it is possible to rollover budget in anticipation of future events/needs.
   ii. There was a question to clarify policy as this sounded different from what past Chairs have been told. Bob Craig clarified that a division has to spend its money eventually. It cannot accumulate more than its budget.

7. LSI co-sponsored pre-conference to honor Jim Taylor.
   a. There were 5 keynote speakers.
   b. A book will be coming out from pre-conference with selection of pre-conference papers for inclusion in the book being made over the next.

8. For the pre-conference for Chicago, Richard Buttny requested ideas (by email or otherwise).

**Old Business**

A. LSI Reception
   1. At 2007 meeting, Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz asked if the budget could be used to help fund an off-site dinner at the conference. This was to be looked into. For 2008, Richard Buttny offered to organize an off-site LSI reception partially funded by the division. This reception will occur at McClean’s Pub on Peel St., ~ 1.5 blocks up from Rene Levaque (before St. Catherine St.).

B. LSI website—No new updates. Given the new system of dealing with the website developed by ICA headquarters, Mark Aakhus suggested that it is not worth the energy to do a lot of changes to the site as it is fairly self-updating. Individuals now can add announcements. Also, officers can send messages from the website. Division members can send messages to officers to post, and the website can be used as a knowledge repository.

C. Extended Abstracts vs. Full Papers
   1. The membership discussed various ideas to deal with this concern. In the end, the idea that had the broadest support was to judge abstracts against abstracts rather than evaluating abstracts against papers for acceptance. That was how the evaluation was conducted this year.
   2. Should acceptance rate of abstracts be in paper call? People submitting abstracts would know. The division decided to continue the current model for another year.
D. Discussion of Paper Submissions. Members offered the following suggestions or questions in 2007:

1. The division leadership should see if people who are submitting are members, and if not, send an email to encourage them to join the division. (Note: This was done for 2008).
2. Should there be a top 4, rather than top 3 panel? The division feedback was that a top 3 panel was good to give more attention to those top papers.
3. The membership requested that a top 3 (or 4 panel) NOT be programmed in opposition of other, related divisions’ top paper panel. For example, this year there was a conflict with the PR and Health Communication top 3 panel. The scheduling of the top 3 or top 4 panels is an ICA matter (rather than a solution that the LSI division could implement)
4. There was a suggestion in the past to have high density panels. However, this was not tried this year as none were proposed.
5. Solicit senior scholars to be a part of panels. This also was not attempted this year as there were no specific proposals to do this. For the Chicago conference, there was interest in getting a senior scholar to present. Specific suggestions included:
   a. Getting a senior scholar in a related field to present (i.e., Michael Silverstein). This could be a key note speech at the level of the division.
   b. Could videorecord the key note speech and make that available, perhaps on the web?
   c. Maybe get other divisions to co-sponsor and work the presentation into the ‘Key Words’ theme of conference.
6. There was a question regarding moving away from respondents for panels. If someone wanted to assign a respondent to a proposed panel, s/he could do that. However, there will be more time for presenters if there are no respondents.
   - Karen Tracy suggested that it would be appropriate and helpful to have a respondent for the top 3 panel. The division member agreed with this suggestion. For the top 3 panel, the programmer will consider if respondent appropriate. For the other panels, there will not be respondents unless it’s part of a proposed panel.
7. There was a suggestion from last year to take advantage of technology by having panels in which attendees are encouraged to download papers ahead of time for discussion during the conference. This was not tried for this year’s conference.
8. Additional note on panel programming: Patrice Buzzanell is planning for 2009 to organize a discussion among program planners regarding best practices within/among divisions. Some examples of best practices include: high density panels, unplugged panels, no top papers, top papers spread throughout division panels. This discussion will be held online.

E. Elections & Chain of succession for LSI Division Officers:
1. Specifically (with current officers):
   a. Mark Aakhus was the conference planner for ICA 07 (San Francisco) and ICA 08 (Montreal).
   b. The incoming vice-chair, Richard Buttny, did not have any division-related responsibilities for the SF conference and undertook coordination of the LSI reception for ICA 08 (Montreal); Richard officially assumed officer position at the ICA 08 conference (San Francisco).
   c. For ICA in Montreal, 2008, Mark will be chair and conference organizer. As vice-chair, Richard could organize a pre-conference, but LSI sponsored the Jim Taylor Pre-Conference.
   d. For ICA in Chicago, 2009, Mark will be chair; Richard will do division programming; that will also be the year to elect a new secretary and vice chair.

2. General Model Succession of VP-Chair for LSI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>May organize a pre-conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Chair &amp; organize conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Election 08
   a. Incoming Vice-Chair, Secretary
   b. Need nominees by 8/1/08; within 1+ week a biography statement will need to be submitted.

**New Business**

A. Election Nominees
   1. By Aug. 1st, need at least 2 candidates for each position. A week later, candidates need to have statements prepared.
   2. Nominations were solicited from floor. Nominees not present will be contact to confirm their interest.
   4. Suggestions for Secretary: open.
   5. Others can email Richard Buttny or Mark Aakhus about additional names or interest in running for a position.

B. Next Year’s Preconference—suggestions and discussion:
   1. From Francois Cooren, Practical implications of LSI: Does LSI research matter for the ‘real world’?
   2. Richard Buttny noted that someone will need to take the lead on organizing the pre-conference. Interested parties should contact Mark Aakhus. There was some interest in co-sponsorship a pre-conference.
Announcements
A. Francois Cooren is running for ICA president.
B. Francois also is finishing his editorship of *Communication Theory*.
C. There is interest from *Communication Methods and Measures* in submissions related to LSI methods. Mark Aakhus is associate editor for this journal.

Adjourned at 5:50 p.m.