The new apprentice reviewer option was explained. Under this new initiative, individuals who would like to review for the Journal but lack one of the usual reviewer credentials will be mentored by the editors for one year. At the end of the year the apprentice reviewer and co-editors will evaluate the experience and it will be decided if the apprentice will come on board as a reviewer for a full three year term.

Rich and Leigh thanked the retiring manuscript reviewers for their service and reminded them that could serve another term as a reviewer after laying out a year.

Rich reported that the number of manuscripts submitted has increased, thus the need for more reviewers. The Journal averages printing around 30% of submitted manuscripts. Leigh reported on this fall’s themed issue on social psychology and advising. Some articles submitted for the issue have been held over to spring.

There was discussion regarding accessibility of journal articles to researchers within the field. It was noted that the Journal is listed in the EBSCO Education Research Complete database. Marsha reported that Journal articles have been scanned and loaded as the first portion of the beta version of the “members only” section of the NACADA website (accessible at this time through members’ MyNACADA account at www.nacada.ksu.edu/downloadcenter/dclookup.php). Editorial Board members have been asked to test the system and report their suggestions to her at miller@ksu.edu.

Some editorial board members are afraid that the NACADA Journal is being overlooked by researchers. While the abstracts are on ERIC they are not enough. Not all campuses subscribe to the EBSCO Education Research Complete database. Marsha indicated that she would look at the EBSCO contract to determine contract length and exclusivity of our EBSCO contract. (Note: review of the EBSCO contract found that NACADA has had an exclusive contract with EBSCO since August 2007. NACADA has met the three year basic requirement and at this point either party can notify the other in writing at least 90 days before the anniversary date that they wish to nullify the contract. The contract does not allow for listing of the Journal in any other research databases. Marsha has contacted EBSCO with questions regarding how researchers can access the EBSCO complete database.)

Josh reported on NACADA’s work with international partners. He suggested reaching out to international researchers in the field.

Janet reported on the updated draft of the NACADA Research Agenda. The call for research grant proposals has been revised based upon this draft. It was noted that research grant recipients are required to submit a manuscript and Marsha follows up with
recipients three times a year until a manuscript has been submitted. Janet asked the editors for input on whether the new research agenda aligns with what is publishable in the Journal. Rich noted that manuscripts that are turned down usually are due to inadequacies of design and methodology or a lack of conclusions and/or, implications. Grant recipients are asked to acknowledge NACADA research grants in any publications or presentations. Marsha will check with Janine Allen and Cathleen Smith (current grant recipients) to see if they acknowledged NACADA in the two articles they have published elsewhere.

Ada asked if the Journal has every partnered with ASHE on research; no one was aware of such a partnership. Rich announced that both keynote speakers in Denver have agreed to write for the Journal based upon their addresses. It is hoped that Dr. Applegate will expand upon his implications for advising. George Steele also has agreed to write on research conducted at the Ohio Learning Network that was funded through a Lumina grant.

Rich also identified and spoke to two poster presenters at the conference who had conducted research in advising and will follow-up with requests to write articles for the Journal.

Marsha reported on member participation in the book review.

Rich distributed a sign-up sheet to present at NACADA regional conferences. Individual Editorial Board members should submit a proposal using the annual conference session abstract to their region conference and present using a version of the PowerPoint and handout used at this conference. The editorial board member is only responsible for discussing writing for the Journal; the Executive Office representative will talk about writing for other NACADA venues.

There was discussion of how to make the Journal more visible to members. Josh noted that all current NACADA members receive a print copy of the Journal twice each year. It was suggested that the Writing for NACADA handout be sent with exhibit materials to regions where no Writing for NACADA session is presented.

Rich asked Editorial Board members if any Editorial Board member would consider becoming co-editors when Rich and Leigh’s term ends next October. Rich and Leigh are willing to serve another term but wanted to give other members a chance to volunteer. The Editorial Board unanimously supported another three year term for Rich and Leigh.

Rich discussed the review process including the letter sent notifying authors that a review has been completed and providing them with anonymous reviewer comments. He said that he will be more diligent in bcc’ing reviewers so they can see all reviews of a manuscript. It was noted that any rewrites are sent to the original reviewers for continuity.