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Report

Our philosophy continues to be to maintain the Journal as a respectable scholarly publication while making it interesting and useful to academic advisors. Following from the NACADA definition of scholarly inquiry, we believe that the success of the Journal, and of the National Academic Advising Association, is fostered when advising practice, research, and theory are intertwined.

Publication Status

The NACADA Journal remains on a timely publication schedule. The number of manuscripts received and published by the NACADA Journal from 2002 through July 31, 2015 is shown in the following table. The number of manuscripts received from 2002 through July 31, 2015 was 569. Of those 569 manuscripts, 139 were at some point accepted for publication (24%).

It is important to note that of the 35 submitted between August 2014 and July 31, 2015, 32 (89%) were returned to the author(s) for revision; in addition, there are currently 16 manuscripts currently undergoing author revision.

There continues to be a sufficient flow for the Journal’s publication schedule of two issues per year. As of this writing in August 2015, manuscripts for issue 35(2) are undergoing copy editing, with the issue expected to be mailed to members in December 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Original Manuscripts Received</th>
<th>Original Manuscripts Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>569*</td>
<td>139*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As of 7-31-2015

Overall percent of submitted articles published since 2002 = 24%
2014-15 percent of submitted articles published (as of 7-31-15) = 37%

Changes Since 2014
Three significant events have occurred since the 2014 Annual Report. First, the Journal has become open-access. Second, a 2015 NACADA sponsored survey titled “NACADA Scholarly Venue Author Survey” was administered to authors of all NACADA publications during the period of May 28, 2015 to June 15, 2015, including authors publishing both articles and book reviews in the NACADA Journal. The detailed results specific to writing for the NACADA Journal are included in appendix 1. In summary, 32 survey respondents wrote for the NACADA Journal, with 30 of 32 (94%) agreeing with the statement “I found writing for NACADA publications a positive experience.”

The third significant event is the offering by and approval of Susan Campbell and Wendy Troxel to serve as co-editors of the Journal beginning in October 2016.

Future Plans

During the 2015-2016 editorial cycles, Susan and Wendy will be working with Leigh and Rich to learn the processes involved. Also, the NACADA Publications Advisory Board will be reviewing and making recommendations based on the spring 2015 NACADA Scholarly Venue Author Survey, including concerning writing for the Journal.
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Appendix 1

Executive Summary 2015 NACADA scholarly venue author survey – Journal authors’ responses

Demographics:

- 32 of 58 (55%) survey respondents wrote for the NACADA Journal
- 13 of the 32 journal authors (41%) had written for no other NACADA publication venue
- 30 of 32 (94%) agreed with the statement “I found writing for NACADA publications a positive experience
- Neither of the two respondents disagreeing with the above statement had written for any other NACADA publication venue; both published separate articles in issue 34(1) of the Journal
- 16 (50%) of journal authors completed a master’s thesis
- 24 (78%) had completed a doctoral dissertation
- 20 (63%) had published in another peer-reviewed journal prior to writing for NACADA
- 21 (66%) of journal authors are NACADA members as compared to 91% of the book authors

Summary of responses for write-in questions in order of most often listed

Identify the one best supports NACADA provide authors (29 comments):
- Helpful feedback (9 comments)
- Helpful individuals (editors and staff) (8 specific comments)
- Developmental editing (6 comments)
- Variety of venues to help authors develop (2 comments)

Identify one writing support you would like to see that was not available to you as an author (24 responses)
- Nothing. (Sample response: responsibility of author to submit an acceptable paper) (10 responses)
- Writing partners or writing mentors and tools to connect to them (6 responses)

What one thing do you wish you would have known going into the author process? (24 responses)
- No surprises (8 response)
- Clear timelines for each stage (4 responses)
- How many revisions were expected (2 responses)

What one thing do you wish you would have known going into post-acceptance (copy edit & production)? (24 responses)
- Nothing (8 responses)
- Timeline (how much time I should schedule for turnarounds) (5 responses)
- How easy it was to work with Nancy Vesta (2 comments)

What one thing can NACADA do to make the largest positive impact on potential authors’ understanding of the WRITING for NACADA process? (25 comments)
- Nothing (7 comments)
• Provide online and face-to-face training (7 comments)
• Provide writing mentors or writing partners (4 comments)

What one thing can NACADA do to make the largest impact on authors’ understanding of the REVISION process? (25 comments)
• NACADA already does a good job (9 comments)
• Provide mentors (3 comments)
• Provide better directions from editors (3 comments)
• Provide clear timelines (3 comments)
• Provide clear writing guidelines (2 comments)

What one thing can NACADA do to make the largest positive impact on potential authors’ understanding of the ACCEPTANCE process? (23 comments)
• Nothing, the process is clear now (11 comments)
• Provide a clear timeline (3 comments)
• Provide testimony from previous authors (3 comments)

What one thing can NACADA do to make the largest impact on authors’ understanding of the POST-ACCEPTANCE production process? (24 comments)
• Nothing, can’t think of anything, copy editor does a good job communicating (11 comments)
• Help author understand the copy edit process (3 comments)
• Clear guidelines for each venue, easily accessible from a variety of locations on the web (2 comments)
• Provide realistic turnaround times (2 comments)

Analysis (to be shared with the PAB and Journal Editorial Board)

Overall the 32 authors who wrote for the NACADA Journal are happy with the current supports and feedback provided by the editors, copy editor, and EO staff. Many (up to 48% on any given question) indicate that no further support is needed and appreciated the feedback given both in the revision stage and in copy edit.

Those replying with ideas for increased support of authors suggested:
• Writer training opportunities (both online and workshops)
• Writing and revision mentors/partners
• Clear timelines for all steps in the process
• Help understanding the copy edit process