1. Kathleen Lacey distributed copies of additional handouts to assist the Committee in its deliberations regarding the ranking of law journals. A short discussion ensued about the content of the handouts but no decisions were made on rankings. The Committee decided to devote the next meeting to continued discussion of the law journals.

2. Deborah Gaut distributed handouts and made a presentation to the Committee regarding the various Business Communications journals, conference proceedings and professional organizations. Following a lengthy discussion of these topics, the Committee voted to add three organizations to the existing list of “key disciplinary associations” contained in the CBA definition of “academic qualification”. These three organizations are as follows: (1) Association for Business Communication (ABC), (2) National Communication Association (NCA), and (3) International Communication Association (ICA).

3. One issue that the Committee has debated from the inception of the Task Force in early 2005 is the appropriate ranking of published proceedings in the CBA IC documentation. Central to this debate is the fact that there are vast differences among the disciplines and the sponsoring organizations when it comes to the published output from a conference. For example, some conferences publish full-length papers as a matter of course while others publish only the “best” papers. Some conferences publish either full-length papers or a shortened abstract, with the choice left to the authors. In some disciplines, full-length papers are never published in the proceedings, but a 1-paragraph abstract is included in the published proceedings. At other meetings, nothing actually appears in print related to the presentation of a paper. Furthermore, most conference papers don’t go through the same level of rigor that is applied when a paper is submitted to a refereed journal for review.

Given these variations and the obvious difficulty of comparing “apples with oranges” when it comes to published proceedings, and the possibility that someone could become “academically qualified” with only one published proceedings paper (which would likely raise questions from the AACSB accreditation team), the Committee voted unanimously to include all published proceedings from selective key disciplinary associations, whether a complete paper or an abstract, in the “Support 1” IC category. Prior to this, publication of a full-length paper presented at “the most selective national scholarly meeting of a key disciplinary association” was classified as a “Quality” publication. The Committee noted that
CBA Faculty should not view a publication in a conference proceedings as an end in itself, but rather as a stepping stone to the eventual publication in a refereed journal.

4. At several points during today’s discussions, it became evident that CBA needs to define what is meant by “peer-reviewed journal”, a term used in CBA documentation and central to the appropriate characterization of some IC items. The Committee will work on developing such a definition at a future time.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Herb Hunt
Recording Secretary

These minutes have been approved.