The duties of the vice-chair of the Public Address Division seemed daunting exactly one year ago. Not only do you have to organize the panels for the division, but you also have to accomplish this task with relatively little knowledge of how NCA organizes the convention, makes decisions about its processes or how the “All Academic” system will perform. I couldn’t have completed my responsibilities without the support and assistance of Past-Chair Chuck Morris and the Vice-Chair Elect, Angela Ray. Their assistance was invaluable as I made decisions regarding reviewers, sessions, special sessions, and award procedures. If I am indebted to Chuck and Angela, I likely owe an entire limb to Mari Boor Tonn. Over a year ago, before she had completed her own tasks in this position, she began sending me lengthy emails about what had worked for her. Her emails were specific, often directive, but never pushy, and without them I don’t believe that my year in this position would have proceeded as smoothly as it has.

Acknowledgments:

This year, I followed Mari’s practice from 2009; that is, I used three reviewers rather than two for each paper, panel, and round-table submission. This proved to be extremely helpful in two respects. First, it helped to resolve the problem of split decisions. Although I did read submissions with widely varied evaluations, I rarely found myself in a position where I, alone, was overruling the considered decision of a single reviewer. Second, by using three reviewers I was able to distribute the load of papers/panels proposals so that most reviewers only considered 4 to 6 proposals rather than 10 or more. In all, 57 individuals reviewed papers and proposals for this year’s conference. I think that that might be a record. I wish to thank the following reviewers:

Jennifer Abbott; Paul Achter; Jacqueline Bacon; Vanessa Beasley; Emily Berg; Carl Burgchardt; Carolyn Calloway-Thomas; Josue Cisneros; Tasha Dubriwny; Jonathan Edwards; Jeremy Engles; Joseph Faina; Leslie Harris; Mike Hogan; Lisa Hogan; Davis Houck; Buddy Howell; Brandon Inabinet; Meryl Irwin; Jim Jasinski; Eric Jenkins; Robin Jensen; John Jordan; Bethany Keeley; Jillian Klean Zwilling; Stephen Klien; James Klumpp; Cindy Koenig Richards; Ben Krueger; Rebecca Kuehl; Kristy Maddux; Todd McDorman; Brian McGee; Sara Mehitretter Drury; Jennifer Mercieca; Chuck Morris; John Murphy; Shawn Parry-Giles; Sam Perry; Jessica Prody; Aric Putnam; Tracey Quigley Holden; James Ragsdale; Michele Ramsey; Angela Ray; Alyssa Samek; Valerie Schrader; Susan Schultz Huxman; Amy Slagell; Belinda Stillion Southard;
Submission and Session Statistics:

The Public Address Division received 105 total submissions this year. That is 24 less than the 129 submissions we received in 2009. Individual paper submissions totaled 84 (10 less than in 2009), while session submissions totaled 21 (14 less than last year).

Since we are often concerned about trends in this division, I offer the following data culled from Vice Chair Reports and past PAD Business Meeting minutes. 8 of the 21 panels were rejected. 13 of the panels were accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Paper Submissions</th>
<th>Panel Submissions</th>
<th>Total Submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (San Francisco)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 (Chicago)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 (San Diego)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 (Chicago)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the fact that this year's conference is not in a more centrally located part of the country, I was pleased by these numbers. You'll notice, for example, that our paper submissions are up, slightly, from 2008 when we were last in California.

Overall our acceptance rate percentages were significantly lower than last year and only slightly lower than in 2008. The acceptance rate percentage for panel proposals was 61.9%. The acceptance rate percentage for individual papers was 56%.

With respect to these acceptance/rejection statistics I would note the following. The loss of 3 slots impact the numbers somewhat; however, I also made two decisions in the planning process for which I take responsibility. First, among the panels that I assembled from individual submissions, I chose not to place more than four presenters and one respondent on any single panel so that all presenters would have at least 10 minutes for their presentation. Second, due to the competitiveness of the pool and the limited number of slots, I rejected panel or individual
submissions that received only one “accept” rating from three reviewers. I tried to accepted individual papers and panels that received two accept votes from three separate reviewers, but there were some exceptions in cases where the overall rating of the submission was low.

Awards:

Reviewer’s ratings of submitted papers were tabulated and rank-ordered by the All Academic computer system, and I created a “Top Papers” session for the division’s very best papers. This panel includes the winner of the Robert Gunderson Award for top student paper in public address and the Wrage-Baskerville Award for the best contributed essay submission. Before I award these two prizes I would like to acknowledge the third presenter who will be a part of the Top Paper panel this afternoon from 3:30 to 4:45 in this room.

Professor Jeffrey Mehlretter Drury from Central Michigan University has written a wonderful essay titled, "A Time for Judging: President Barack Obama and the Crisis in Cairo.” As you might imagine, the division received many panel and paper proposals on President Obama this year, but this submission stood out. One reviewer commented that the author offered “an engaging and critically provocative analysis of Obama’s speech.” Another reviewer explained that the essay was “a well written paper that provides a non-conventional yet throughout interpretation of crisis (krisis) rhetoric related to a foreign policy address.” The author's contribution was “illuminating.”

The Robert J. Gunderson Award is given annually for the Top Student Paper in Public Address. This year’s winner is Sean Luechtefeld from the University of Maryland. His paper is titled, "A Petition in Boots: Jacob Coxey’s Constitution of Citizenship in 1894." The paper examines how Jacob Coxey and the industrial army movement of the late Nineteenth Century practiced a particular form of citizenship. Of this paper one reviewer commented, “This paper is fascinating as it treats the issues of class but also the issue of citizenship at another historical time in a compelling way.”

The Wrage-Baskerville Award is given annually to the Top Contributed Paper in Public Address. This year's winners are Professors Ronald Zboray and Mary Zboray of the University of Pittsburgh. The title of their paper is, “I Have Said my Say: Ordinary Women and Partisan Speech Making in the Antebellum Era.” This essay considers “impromptu partisan addresses” that ordinary antebellum women presented to small audiences. It is based on a study of some 2,000 manuscript letters and diaries authored by 450 different women and girls in antebellum New England. One reviewer called this essay “an extremely strong, very thoroughly researched, fascinating paper.” “Interesting and important” were the words used by a second reviewer, and the third reviewer declared, “This is a superb paper, offering new insights into nineteenth-century women’s political involvement.”
Overall Assessment of the Convention Planning Process

Despite the fact that we lost 3 slots for this year's convention, I feel proud and humbled to have had the chance to put together this year's panel sessions. I feel as though we enhanced the overall quality of the panels our division, and I am pleased to have balanced the inclusion of established and burgeoning scholars in our program. The breadth of scholarship within the Public Address Division continues to amaze me.

Similar to Mari’s experiences last year, I believe that All Academic performed well though not perfectly. I received no correspondence from submitters who felt that the system had locked them out or didn’t accept their proposals. I do admit to a little frustration with the interface for All Academic. As many of you know, you cannot use a browser’s “page back” feature with this system without corrupting the data that you are immediately examining. I would advise next year’s Vice-Chair to repeatedly examine their “accepted” and “rejected” lists to be sure that they system accurately records their intentions.

I want to thank all of my reviewers one final time. Your assistance was invaluable. Thank you very, very much. I hope that everyone enjoys the 2010 Convention.