

In-House Editorial Board and Procedures

The College of Education offers an in-house research support service to all faculty by providing an opportunity to have manuscripts for publication reviewed by a senior faculty member prior to journal submission. The In-House Editorial Board members, listed below, are full professors in the COE and have agreed to serve in this capacity.

The goal of these reviews is to provide you with an independent assessment of your research manuscript before you send it out for review. This can help you identify major issues that may arise in the review process, *a priori*, increasing your chance of getting your work published in high profile journals within a reasonable time frame.

In-House Editorial Board Members

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|-------|
| Susan Copeland | Ed Specialties | Vi Florez | TEELP |
| Hector Ochoa | Ed Specialties | Trenia Walker | TEELP |
| Cathy Qi | Ed Specialties | Eli Duryea | HESS |
| Rick Meyer | LLSS | Todd Seidler | HESS |
| Jan Armstrong | IFCE | David Scott | HESS |
| Lee Van Horn | IFCE | | |
| Jay Parkes | IFCE | | |

Procedures for submitting a manuscript for review:

1. Manuscripts should be submitted by the faculty member first to Associate Dean David Scott who will then forward them to the reviewer based on the following request from the faculty member:
 - a. *Blind Review* – a reviewer from the list above will be selected but will not be known to the faculty member. Feedback will be anonymous. (Reviewer will remove name and initials from tracked changes in Word). Faculty will return the manuscript with edits and comments to Assoc. Dean Scott who will return it to the faculty member.
 - b. *Double-Blind Review* – Same procedures as above only the faculty member’s name will not be included in the manuscript that is sent to the reviewer.
 - c. *Select Review* – the faculty member sends the manuscript to Associate Dean Scott and indicates which board member he/she would like as the reviewer. The reviewer will be contacted first by Assoc. Dean Scott and, if available, will be sent the manuscript. At that point, the reviewer may communicate directly with the faculty member during the review process.
2. The timeframe for the review is 2-3 weeks. If this is not possible due to reviewer workload or other circumstances, a different reviewer may be requested/selected.
3. All manuscripts submitted for review should be at a well-developed stage in which the purpose is to obtain final suggestions, edits, and improvements.