

Basic Communication Course Annual

Volume 36

Article 2

2024

Editor's Page

Angela M. Hosek

Ohio University - Main Campus, hosek@ohio.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#), [Mass Communication Commons](#), [Other Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hosek, Angela M. (2024) "Editor's Page," *Basic Communication Course Annual*: Vol. 36, Article 2.

Available at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol36/iss1/2>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Basic Communication Course Annual by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlengen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

Editor's Page

Angela M. Hosek, Ohio University

The *Basic Communication Course Annual* is home for scholarship related to all aspects of the introductory course, ranging from curriculum design and the pedagogical process to effective administration and assessment. With my first volume with *BCCA*, I have extended and built upon the tremendous work of previous editors and scholars who have championed and shared their work in the *Annual*. In doing so, Issue 36 features empirical, theoretical, and analytical essays that require us to think about how students use instructor feedback in the classroom, to consider new ways to conduct assessment, to contemplate the implications of course names and labels, and to imagine how critical deliberation might promote social justice in the basic course. Specifically, Drew T. Ashby-King, Melissa A. Lucas, and Lindsey B. Anderson focus on how students experience and use instructor feedback and the tensions that arise from students' views of the feedback. Next, Miranda N. Rouse conducts an analysis of rubrics to highlight the ways in which public speaking assessments and curriculum have privileged normative, able-bodied, and neurotypical individuals, prompting us to consider how this positioning creates power imbalances and inequities among students and instructors. Joshua E. Young and Allison D. Brenneise challenge us to consider how using the term *basic* to describe the course and its students, instructors, and stakeholders has exceedingly and prolongingly limited the power of the course and its purpose. Finally, Jennifer Y. Abbott, Jordin Clark, and James Proszek offer critical engagement as a strategy for bringing civic engagement and justice to the forefront of the basic course.

In continuing the forum essays, for this issue, I wanted to offer space to engage the course community in conversation about topics and issues we have been reluctant to share or question. In response to this forum, Carly Densmore and Jessica Cherry argue for increased visibility, attention, and training on grief in the classroom and use critical grief pedagogy as a frame to orient curriculum and teacher training to address the unavoidable ways grief permeates spaces of teaching and

learning. Nicholas T. Tatum and Jeffrey T. Child call for increased attention to the real and pressing concern of burnout in the basic course at all levels, and they leave us with many questions to answer and address. Dious Joseph's piece argues for a proactive approach that integrates artificial intelligence (AI) into foundation courses and shares some of the possibilities and concerns that may result. Finally, Kate Swartz considers the case for "ungrading" and how it can be practiced in the introductory course. The forums conclude with an expertly crafted critical reflection response form Kristina Ruiz-Mesa and Ana Terminel Iberri that synthesizes and elevates the arguments and possibilities set forth in the forum essays. I extend my sincere thanks to Kristina and Ana for their extension and mindful contributions to the forum essays.

I want to extend a special note of gratitude to Brandi N. Frisby (University of Kentucky) for her support and advice during my transition to editor; to James Pepper Kelly (Ohio University) for his thorough and critical eye and unyielding desire to talk about possibilities for the journal; and to the e-scholarship manager, Maureen Schlangen (University of Dayton) for her ongoing support and longtime stewardship of the journal. The journal also benefits in every respect thanks to the effort and labor of the Editorial Board (EB) and countless reviewers. Their contributions to the manuscripts in this issue have been invaluable.

As we look to the next two years under my editorship, I look forward to moving forward and elevating the work and prominence of our journal. One change for upcoming issues during my editorship, determined in consultation with the EB, will be that the journal submission date will move to the early part of the year, with the published issue release anticipated by end of May. In doing so, we ensure that the bulk of the work for the *Annual*, its contributors, reviewers, and editorial staff will happen during a semester cycle. The call for Volume 37 is included at the end of this issue.

Lastly, on behalf of myself and all of his former advisees, mentees, students, and collaborators, I would like to dedicate my first issue to the legacy and memory of a basic communication course pioneer, Dr. William (Bill) Seiler (University of Nebraska-Lincoln), who generously served as my own doctoral advisor. As we continue to find ways to positively increase the impact of the introductory course, I hope you find new ideas and meaningful challenges to contemplate in this issue of the *Basic Communication Course Annual*.