2015 NACADA Journal Editorial Board minutes. October 6, 2015. 12:30 – 2 PM. Las Vegas


Rich and Leigh introduced themselves and incoming co-editors Wendy Troxel and Susan Campbell.

Those transitioning off the Editorial Board after this meeting include: Janet Schulenberg, Jesse Carduner, Charity Welch, and Terri Peters. They were thanked for their service. The editors welcomed new members Craig McGill (2016 apprentice reviewer) and Amy Ribera, along with Karen Mottarella who is coming back on the Editorial Board after a year hiatus.

Rich announced that the next issue, 35(2), is almost through copy edit and should be sent for set up soon. The Journal’s acceptance rate has gone down this year because of an increase in the number of submissions. The editors noted that authors willing and able to revise and resubmit their manuscript are the most likely to have their manuscript published.

The editors highlighted three changes since last fall’s meeting:

- the Journal became open access,
- completion of a scholarly venue author survey this summer co-sponsored by the NACADA Publications Advisory Board,
- the naming of the new co-editors.

Results of the survey were highlighted: 94% of Journal authors found writing for NACADA a positive experience. 63% of the Journal’s authors are NACADA members which means that the Journal is getting out to scholars beyond the NACADA membership. Journal authors appear happy with review process and the constructive feedback they receive. Authors indicated they wanted clearer timelines and some would like mentors for the revision process. It was noted that Melissa and Craig have been named to the work group discussing author support across all NACADA publication venues. This work group will report ideas to NACADA Executive Director Charlie Nutt next summer.

The editors discussed manuscript completion. There are several manuscripts that were not rejected but have yet to be revised. Some authors seem to think that “revise and resubmit” is a message to “go away;” that is not the intent. The Editorial Board discussed ideas for getting a better yield on the “revise and resubmit” manuscripts. Rich and Leigh will craft an email to send authors of current “revise and resubmit” manuscripts with Taylor sending the email.

The editors have added a suggested deadline for resubmission of 60 days to help meet timeline concerns. Rich and Leigh also have worked with several authors with specific questions in hopes of supporting authors so they can complete the process. It was noted that even with follow-up NACADA research grants have not yielded as many Journal articles as hoped (17%). There needs to discussion with the Research Committee regarding how to best increase the “printed article” yield from NACADA grant recipients.

Charlie stopped in to thank all Editorial Board members for their work on the Journal. He reiterated the association’s support of authors. While we are unsure of the eventual relationship between the newly
approved Research center, the research agenda, and the Journal, Editorial Board members should know that the Research Center won’t take over the work of the Journal or the Research Committee. There will be a collaborative and cooperative effort between the three entities to make research more important.

Support writing discussion: The current “Writing for NACADA” session focuses on publication venues within the association. There needs to be another session focused on different types of writing. We could consider changing the current session title to something that highlights publishing within NACADA rather than writing itself. The presenters of today’s “Writing for NACADA” session will ask participants to share the kinds of support they expect and/or would like to see.

Mentorship possibilities discussion: Ideas included the possibility of pairing an author who is overwhelmed with an author/editor who is experienced. Editorial Board members (who are not reviewing the particular article and who have the appropriate background) could volunteer to mentor an author. It was suggested that other NACADA members who have published in the Journal could serve as mentors during the revise and resubmit phase. It was noted that perhaps the senior editors could help in this manner.

It was suggested that some manuscripts need critical feedback before they are submitted. The coeditors might write an article on why and how to write for the Journal. Perhaps an online Writing Circle could be established as a pre-submission offering. Issues that need to be addressed before establishing a Writing Circle include reciprocity for those serving as mentors and the need for at least one developmental mentor within the Circle. It was feared that the Writing Circle effort could be misinterpreted if an editorial board member was within the Circle. Issues surrounding impact factor and self-citing were expressed. For a Writing Circle to be successful NACADA members not on the Editorial Board would need to be involved.

Mentoring should help create a better “yield” but help can come in various forms. The editors noted that in some cases they have rewritten whole manuscripts with edits were so significant that they toyed with the idea of co-authorship.

Leigh reviewed the process the editors use to decide which manuscripts go to review. Board members asked which lens they should use when reviewing... methodology or content expert? The coeditors answered “both”. The editors try to balance reviewer skill sets when choosing reviewers to make sure all areas are covered within reviews. A couple of years ago the Journal was short on quantitative reviewers but hopefully that is now covered. As such the editors asked reviewers to look at the data and question data when necessary. We do not want to publish data that are not right.

The editors were asked if they reject any advising pieces outright because they don’t fit with the Journal’s mission. They noted that program reviews are rejected but otherwise they remind author of the charge of the Journal. One of the hallmarks of the profession is building upon the literature to present a contribution; as such authors must do a thorough lit review and build their article on that review. When authors talk about campus data based upon a solid lit review then a submission can work. It was also noted that all manuscripts must include implications for practice and a limitations section.

The Editorial Board was asked to think about how we can best “give a nudge” to authors.

Book review: Taylor reported that 72 reviews were included in Journal issues 35-1, 35-2, and 36-1. Those three issues featured books from 32 publishers; Jossey-Bass provided the most books, Collins the
next most. The number of books received was down this year. The “default” rate remains low. 23% of reviewers are repeat reviewers. Reviewers can review one year after their last review. The percent of reviews needing significant editing has gone done to 15% with misuse of voice (i.e., first and second person) the biggest editing issue. The book review website now features four reviews as exemplary of what we are looking for. The Journal coeditors choose one to publish in each issue.

The “Writing for NACADA” session is this afternoon in Octavius 1, 2, 3. Editorial Board members were asked to sign up to present the session at their region conferences in the spring. It was noted that the Journal Editorial Board and Publications Advisory Board co-sponsor the session.

Rich and Leigh thanked all who review and explained the apprenticeship program. Meeting adjourned.