JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION 2004 Editor's Report to the Editing-Managing Board by Greg Miller, Editor and Stacie Turnbull, Associate Editor (Report Based on Data Available as of May 18, 2004)

Due to the relatively short period of time covered by this report, some aspects of the traditional editor's report are not included. A complete report, including all elements traditionally addressed by the editor, will be submitted for volume 45 at the 2005 Editing-Managing Board meeting.

### **Editorial Staff**

Greg Miller, Editor (2004-2006) Stacie Turnbull, Associate Editor (2004-2006)

Department of Agricultural Education & Studies, Iowa State University 201 Curtiss Hall, Ames, IA 50011-1050 E-mail: gsmiller@iastate.edu Phone: (515) 294-2583 Facsimile: (515) 294-0530

### Regional Editors (2004-2006)

Robert Torres, Teacher Education and North Central Region Editor, University of Missouri Tim Murphy, Distance Education and Southern Region Editor, Texas A&M University Brenda Seevers, Extension & Adult Education and Western Region Editor, New Mexico State University

# **Editing-Managing Board**

Michael Swan, Chair, Western Region, Washington State University (Term Ends 2005)
Rick Rudd, Outstanding Article Selection Committee, Vol. 45, Southern Region, University of Florida (Term Ends 2004)
Rama Radhakrishna, Secretary, North Central Region, Pennsylvania State University (Term

Rama Radhakrishna, Secretary, North Central Region, Pennsylvania State University (Term Ends 2005)

Blannie Bowen, Past Editor, Pennsylvania State University (Term Ends 2005)

### **Editorial Review Board**

### 2002-2004

Richard Joerger, North Central Region, University of Minnesota Patreese Ingram, North Central Region, Pennsylvania State University Donald Johnson, Southern Region, University of Arkansas Cary Trexler, Western Region, University of California - Davis

#### 2003-2005

Tracy Hoover, North Central Region, Pennsylvania State University Barry Croom, Southern Region, North Carolina State University Michael Swan, Western Region, Washington State University

#### 2004-2006

Susan Fritz, North Central Region, University of Nebraska Bill Camp, North Central Region, Cornell University Barry Boyd, Southern Region, Texas A&M University Shannon Washburn, Southern Region, University of Florida Matt Baker, Western Region, Texas Tech University

### **Business Manager**

W. Wade Miller (2002-2004) AGEDS Dept., 217 Curtiss Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011-1050 E-mail: <u>wwmiller@iastate.edu</u> ◆ Phone: 515/294-0895 ◆ Fax: 515/294-0530

Year	Manuscripts Published
2004	16 <sup>a</sup>
2003	35
2002	30
2001	30
2000	45
1999	32
1998	33
1997	33
1996	31
1995	33

#### Table 1. Manuscripts Published by Year

<sup>a</sup> January 1, 2004 to May 18, 2004.

### Table 2. Manuscript Submission Comparison by Year

Year	Unsolicited Manuscripts Submitted
2004	30 <sup>a</sup>
2003	66
2002	79
2001	47
2000	66
1999	58
1998	69
1997	47
1996	41
1995	50

<sup>a</sup> January 1, 2004 to May 18, 2004.

	Initial Submissions				Resubmissions					ept	
Year	Accept	Reject	Under Review	Total Submitted	Accept Rate	Accept	Reject	Under Review	Total Submitted	Accept Rate	Total Accept Rate
2004 <sup>a</sup>	5	6	19	30	46%	3	3	1	7	50%	47%
2003	13	35	18	66	27%	3	1	4	8	75%	31%
2002	25	37	17	79	40%	3	2	4	9	60%	42%
2001	14	19	14	47	42%	1	3	1	5	25%	42%
2000	23	27	16	66	46%	5	2	1	8	71%	49%
1999	21	25	12	58	46%	2	1	2	5	67%	47%
1998	18	25	26	69	42%	1	1	2	4	50%	42%
1997	21	10	16	47	68%	0	1	0	1	0%	66%
1996 <sup>b</sup>					43%					100%	47%

Table 3. Accept/Reject Decisions by Year

<sup>a</sup> January 1, 2004 to May 18, 2004. <sup>b</sup> As reported by Jamie Cano in his 1997 Editor's Report.

# Selected Activities Initiated Since January 1, 2004

# 1. Updated the reviewer database

The reviewer database has been updated. It is hoped that the update will contribute to a more timely review process, while meeting the needs of reviewers relative to availability and expertise. Sixty-two reviewers have been identified through e-mail solicitations.

The reviewer database includes the following information:

- Reviewers' research interest areas.
- Type of research (i.e., qualitative, quantitative, philosophical, and/or historical) the reviewer is qualified to review.
- Reviewer availability. Some reviewers indicated that they were only available during specific times of the year while others set a limit on the number of manuscripts that they would like to receive.

# 2. Began monitoring time taken to complete reviews

As noted in the December 2003 Editor's report, there were a few reviewers who took an excessive amount of time in returning completed reviews. This results in a slow turnaround time for authors. Steps are being taken to create a quicker review for authors. Earlier this year, we identified a small number of reviewers who had held manuscripts for two or more months. These reviewers were contacted at least two times by e-mail. For an even smaller number of manuscripts, it became clear that an alternate reviewer would have to be selected. We are now tracking the amount of time taken by reviewers to complete reviews. If we identify reviewers who are consistently and significantly late, we will remove them from our list of potential reviewers.

# 3. Support for regional editors

Regional editors were provided all materials and information needed to facilitate manuscript reviews. We expect regional editors to occasionally facilitate reviews of articles within their area of expertise and/or facilitate the development of a theme issue.

# 4. Review forms disseminated

Copies of the review forms were disseminated on the AAAE list serve. At the time of submission, authors are asked to indicate on the cover sheet whether their manuscript should be reviewed using the historical, philosophical, qualitative/mixed methods, or quantitative review form. We believe that this will allow us to process manuscripts more quickly, but more importantly, it will ensure that we subject manuscripts to the appropriate review criteria. The historical form was approved for use beginning in January 2004. We have attached it to this report.

# **Final thoughts**

It should be noted that communication between the editor, reviewers, and authors is key to making the review process efficient. If a reviewer finds that he/she is unable to review a manuscript in an appropriate amount of time, they should immediately notify the editor. Additionally, if authors have questions about their manuscript, they are encouraged to contact the editor.

The first issue of 2004 was produced on schedule and in excellent quality. We are thankful for the contributions of our business manager, Wade Miller. We are also grateful for the work of Vickie Marriott and the production staff at Texas A&M University. Finally, we appreciate the excellent work of authors and reviewers. Many people are responsible for producing a high quality journal.