

Rhetoric & Public Address (Hereafter, Rhetoric, Culture & Advocacy) Interest Group Business Meeting
WESTERN STATES COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION
Seattle, WA 2019
Saturday, February 23rd from 7:45-8:45 am

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Roberta Chevrette welcomes everyone, and calls the meeting to order, asking people to take papers as they come in.

II. Approval of Minutes – 2018 RPA Business Meeting

- A. Motion to approve from floor.
- B. Second from floor.
- C. Verbal vote: Minutes approved.

III. Old Business

- A. Chair's Report: Program Planning
 - 1. Competitive Papers: 60 Received (+1 from 2018), 44 programmed (73% acceptance rate)
 - 2. Panels: 4 Received (-2 from 2018), 4 programmed (100% acceptance rate)
 - 3. 16 slots + Business Meeting (consistent with previous years)
 - 4. Roberta describes how we could do more to collaborate with the theme, rather than just solicit papers, in order to have more panel submissions. We received all slots requested.
- B. Additional Officer Reports:
 - 1. Chair-Elect: None from Michael Walker
 - 2. Secretary: None from Jenna Hanchey

IV. New Business

- A. Awards
 - 1. Roberta announces the top 4 papers, and provides a certificate to each of the awardees and monetary awards to the top student paper/top paper and top debut paper:
 - The Blackfeet Nation and Blood Quantum: Argumentative Strategies for Navigating Colonization and Negotiating Identity
Jordan John Christiansen, University of Kansas
 - The Limitations of Lubbock: A Rhetorical Analysis of the "Hub City"
Ma. Angela San Luis Labrador, Texas Tech University
 - Are Title IX Processes Legal? The Legal/Administrative Oscillations of the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter
Samantha Grainger West, University of Colorado Boulder
 - Campus Cults: An Analysis of the International Christian Church Recruitment Script
Jozelle Wong Yu, California State University, Long Beach
 - 2. Top Debut Paper
 - Campus Cults: An Analysis of the International Christian Church Recruitment Script
Jozelle Wong Yu, California State University, Long Beach
 - 3. Top Paper/Top Student Paper:
 - The Blackfeet Nation and Blood Quantum: Argumentative Strategies for Navigating Colonization and Negotiating Identity
Jordan John Christiansen, University of Kansas
- B. Name Change
 - 1. Google Survey Report
 - a. Roberta describes how for many years, every business meeting the name of the interest group comes up. Because we only see each other once a year, we rarely do anything other than debate. In the minutes, you may see that at the meeting last year we formed an ad hoc committee to address the interest group's name. What we did on the committee was look at how our member universities name themselves and frame rhetoric at their institutions, with the idea being that our name should reflect what our member institutions do. Those names were put out on a Google survey. We have 55 responses to the survey, and the top column on the handout shows the number of votes that each of these receive. Someone suggested adding Rhetoric and Public Affairs to the survey after it already opened, so it received a handicap of 3 votes since voting had already started at that was the average votes at that time. You can see that some clear leaders emerged. We also asked people to rank their top 3 choices, and that gave slightly different

results, which is shown in the second data point. So, those were the names that we decided to advance on today's ballot. We wanted to have you know the division represented well in voting on these names. Roberta included the other feedback in what we put in. There were concerns about naming the division in terms of critical cultural studies, that it might push away scholars that don't consider themselves that way. One very personal response targeted at Roberta reveals some tension here.

- b. Aaron Hess—one of the things I'm convinced by is having Rhetorical Studies as the name is parallel with other interest groups. That might be a nice parallel with Performance Studies, etc.
- c. Roberta asks for other feedback, concerns, advocacy for a particular title. Notes that the one that received the second number of votes is Rhetoric and Critical Cultural Studies, and that does reflect what many people do. But Roberta paneled two public address panels and at least some public address papers.
- d. From floor—I noticed the passionate response. It led me to wonder that if someone is interested in starting a new group, what is the process for that?
- e. Roberta—I'm not sure, but we did have a new group started last year.
- f. From floor—so there's a process if someone doesn't end up feeling like the name reflects them, to feel empowered to do something
- g. Jonathan Rossing—do we do anything else beyond theory and criticism that would be excluded by theory and criticism? Maybe rhetorical pedagogy wouldn't be encompassed in that title. Rhetorical studies would open up the division to rhetorical pedagogy/education work as well, and that seems compelling
- h. From floor—I was having similar thoughts about Rhetorical Theory and Criticism, that it doesn't seem exclusionary [Note from Secretary: This person misunderstood Jonathan's point]. Was reading through our mission, and thought this reflects it, and seems to encompass what we do
- i. Roberta—one of the things I thought about the comment that says "if you don't like it the way it is, why don't you go somewhere else?" that comment seemed to target critical/cultural work. So I do want to make room, in case there are dissenting views in the audience. When I was at the #RhetoricSoWhite panel at NCA, there were audience members and speakers who were crying. Scholarship on race has so often been excluded; people hadn't submitted work to QJS since 1990. There was a heightened concern about rhetoric as exclusionary brought up by that panel. So—Rhetorical Studies as a name, does that attend to that concern? Does it open up to invite critical scholarship in and make people feel welcome, even if they haven't been schooled in the same array of scholars that we canonize?
- j. Benny LeMaster—on that note, critical/cultural studies has been a way in to engage that work for those that find a lot of resistance in rhetorical studies. So I have really leaned into critical/cultural studies myself, needing to pause before engaging in rhetorical conversations, knowing it might not be worth my energy.
- k. Jonathan: I don't think changing to Rhetorical Studies solves that problem in any way. But I think that if this division, no matter the name, wants to be proactive, we can also consider changing the bylaws and purposes to put forth a particular interest in work that deals with the marginalized and historically oppressed, without saying that's all we do in a way that might ruffle feathers. But commit to putting that on the foreground, and invite those conversations intentionally. That might do the work better than a name change. At least it's a step.
- l. Michael motions to vote.
- m. Seconded by Sohinee Roy
- n. Michael counts votes.

C. Vote on Proposed Bylaw Changes

- 1. Proposed Bylaw Change #1: Change leadership structure to parallel that of other interest groups: Secretary, Vice-Chair, Chair/Program Planner, Immediate Past Chair
 - a. Justification: to promote continuity and the effective transfer of institutional knowledge and IG procedures. Parallels many of the other interest groups. The way that would be different than our current structure is that the chair elect and the chair don't really do anything together. There is no system for passing down knowledge effectively. We would, if we change, elect a Vice Chair who is included in the Program Planning to know what is included before moving into the work of program planning. As well, the Past Chair would be there to advise.
 - b. Jenna asks clarifying questions.
 - c. Benny clarifies—What's really being added is the immediate past chair. (Yes)

- d. Sohinee Roy—So would there be a change in eligibility to run for these offices? Could someone with a MA or in a MA program run for these positions?
 - e. Roberta—I don't think the current bylaws say anything about qualifications, and we're not changing that. I do think on a case-by-case basis, that someone who has a MA and is well-connected with the academic community could be great. Sohinee is an example. So that's where having a nominating committee to find qualified leaders would help us with that.
 - f. Aaron—so who's attending LA?
 - g. Roberta—Both Chair and Vice-Chair. The Immediate Past Chair would not have those responsibilities.
 - h. Aaron—it's in two different sections of the bylaws, so that's messy. But that would require a different vote, so that's okay.
 - i. Roberta—can we get a motion to vote
 - j. From floor—Motion to vote
 - k. From floor—Seconded
 - l. Verbal vote, motion passes.
2. Proposed Bylaw Change #2: Appoint a nominating committee
 - a. Justification: this would, again, parallel the practices of many other interest groups, and it would help prevent a situation where no one is prepared to run. We have been doing it where whoever comes to the meeting just puts themselves up, spur of the moment. That's why we don't have a ballot for you. If we had a nominating committee we could more actively focus on what we could do, instead of just waiting for people to step into the role.
 - b. Following intercultural, it would be the Immediate Past Chair, and 2 additional
 - c. From floor—Motion to vote
 - d. From floor—Seconded
 - e. Verbal vote, motion passes.
 3. Proposed Bylaw Changes #3 and 4: Change from 4 reviewers to 2-3, with a 3rd assigned in the case of a split decision
 - a. Justification—This would be more accurate to what has been done in practice, in which 2-3 reviewers have typically been assigned. To find 4 reviewers per paper puts an undue burden on reviewers, and this has not happened in the recent past. This would require people reviewing 10 papers. People who sign up to review often don't complete their reviews. Sometimes Chairs have to make the decision of tie-breaker, would like to empower them to make the final decision in the event that we don't have enough reviewers.
 - b. From floor—Motion to vote
 - c. From floor—Seconded
 - d. Verbal vote, motion passes.
 4. Proposed Bylaw Change #5: Require paper reviewers to have a PhD or be ABD.
 - a. Justification: To ensure quality reviews.
 - b. Benny—That would narrow the reviewer pool, which seems related to Change 3-4
 - c. Roberta—I am personally not for this change, because I think it's a good experience for PhD students.
 - d. Michael—do we want to have reviewers be at least the level of paper they're reviewing?
 - e. Roberta—that's what I thought would be important. But I actually would not do that again, because I think if you have student reviewers reviewing student papers, students give higher scores. I don't think we want to entirely preclude faculty papers from the possibility of receiving awards. So I think distributing reviewers randomly might be better for possibility of awards.
 - f. Michael—or perhaps we require at least one faculty reviewer per paper.
 - g. From floor—Motion to vote
 - h. From floor—Seconded
 - i. Verbal vote, motion rejected

D. Votes in for Division Names

1. Michael—Tie between Rhetorical Studies and Rhetoric, Culture & Advocacy
2. Discussion
 - a. Jonathan—Rhetoric, Culture & Advocacy seems the closest to doing in a single name some of the work that came up in conversation. That seems compelling for the interests brought up.
 - b. Michael—I'll put a plug in for Rhetorical Studies.
3. Tie-Breaker ballots collected

E. Elections

1. Vice-Chair
 - a. Floor Nominations
 - i. Benny LeMaster self-nominates
 - ii. Carlos Flores self-nominates
 - b. Vote by ballot
2. Secretary (Term: 2020-2022)
 - a. Floor Nominations
 - i. Carlos Flores not elected to Vice Chair, self-nominates
 - ii. Tyler Rife self-nominates
 - b. Vote by ballot
3. Two Nominating Committee Members
 - a. Floor Nominations
 - i. Amy Pason self-nominates
 - ii. Aaron Hess self-nominates
 - b. Move to vote by acclamation
 - c. Seconded
 - d. Verbal vote, motion to elect Amy and Aaron passes

V. Installation of 2020 Board Members

- A. New Chair: Michael Walker: Discuss WSCA 2020 – Denver. Theme: Communication, Agitation and Justice. Particularly salient to the political times that we're in. Social movements changing the political landscape, and we ought to put social justice work out there. Michael is really excited about this.
- B. Discuss possible future Alaska or Hawaii conference as requested by Time and Place Committee
 1. It jumps up airfare and travel concerns. The last time we had a conference in Alaska was in 2008, while Michael was in his doctoral program.
 2. Benny—no one showed up in Anchorage, and it was really disappointing to present to no one, but also really cool to see the Iditarod.
 3. Amy—in the Freedom of Speech group, they are really interested in partnering with our group. The group also mentioned Hawaii and Anchorage will be cost prohibitive for graduate students, contingent faculty, and those coming from the East coast. We haven't been to Idaho, Oregon in a while that would be great.
 4. Aaron—going to Arizona in 2023.
 5. Michael—asks who is chair for next year.
 6. Amy—can't remember, but they'll be in contact
 7. From floor—lived in Hawaii for 10 years, and it's a distinct cultural community and there's a lot of interesting things historically and culturally that might be useful for people to observe. It's also very convention friendly and family popular. But it is more expensive. It has a lot to offer.
 8. Roberta—I thought when I heard the question, yeah, of course I want to go! But I think my immediate reaction was grounded in warmth and fun. I think the point of being in Hawaii would resonate with some of the concerns of WSCA in terms of doing panels that involve local communities in a space where settler colonialism continues to be very visible. That might be an interesting space to enter academically.
 9. Carlos—going back to costs, I would imagine travel to Hawaii would eat all conference funding for those who get it, and restrict travel to other places.
 10. Michael Klajbor—I also think that Hawaii will have less external lodging for graduate students, it will be much more expensive for graduate students in that respect as well
 11. From floor—there are Airbnbs and hostels, though.
 12. Michael—if the local host has facilities, maybe on campus that they could use to house graduate students, that might be worth looking into
 13. Roberta—it seems that maybe if we did consider going to one of those places, we would need to consider if institutionally we could offer more support for graduate students than previous years.

VI. Results

- A. Name: Rhetoric, Culture & Advocacy
- B. Vice Chair: Benny LeMaster
- C. Secretary: Carlos Flores
- D. Nominating Committee: Amy Pason & Aaron Hess

VII. Announcements from the Floor

- A. Sohinee announces that Review of Communication is now moving to themed issues only.
- i. Kathleen McConnell is the Editor-Elect for *Review of Communication* (vol. 20-23). She has begun reviewing manuscripts. Volume 20 onwards will be “themed issues” only (this is a move away from its previous “general submissions” and “special issues” format). All themed issues will be double-anonymously peer reviewed. Two CFPs are already out:
 1. Black Panther – guest edited by Rachel Griffin and Jonathan Rossing – deadline is April 1 (see attachment)
 2. (Re)Sounding Pedagogy – guest edited by Keith Nainby and Chris McRae – deadline is September 1 (see attachment)
 3. Aims and Scope:
<https://tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?show=aimsScope&journalCode=rroc20>
 4. Editorial Call: https://think.taylorandfrancis.com/review-of-communication-calls-for-papers/?utm_source=CPB_think&utm_medium=cms&utm_campaign=JOA07965
 - ii. Devika Chawla is the new Editor for *Departures in Critical Qualitative Research (DCQR)*. She has begun reviewing manuscripts. Please consider submitting.
 1. Aims and Scope + Submission Guidelines: <http://dcqr.ucpress.edu/content/submit>

VIII. Adjourn