

The Journal of Extension

Volume 41 | Number 1

Article 1

2-1-2003

Editor's Page

Laura Hoelscher

Journal of Extension, joe-ed@jpe.org



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Recommended Citation

Hoelscher, L. (2003). Editor's Page. *The Journal of Extension*, 41(1), Article 1.
<https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/joe/vol41/iss1/1>

This Editor's Page is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences at TigerPrints. It has been accepted for inclusion in *The Journal of Extension* by an authorized editor of TigerPrints. For more information, please contact kokeefe@clemson.edu.



February 2003 // Volume 41 // Number 1



Editor's Page

Abstract

"*JOE* by the Numbers--2002" reports on submission, readership, and review rates for 2002. "*JOE* Needs Good Commentaries" talks about why we need Commentaries and calls attention to some good examples.

JOE by the Numbers--2002

Submission & Readership Rates

2002 was another very good year for *JOE*. Authors submitted 189 articles to *JOE*. That's 23 articles fewer than 2001's all-time high of 212 submissions but above submission rates for 2000 and 1999.

Readership rates continue to climb. In 2002, the *JOE* site had 562,774 visitors who viewed 1,310,318 pages of the journal. That's a 36% increase in visitors from 2001 and a 40% increase in pageviews (a more accurate measure than "hits"). From 2000 to 2002, the number of visitors to *JOE* increased by 104%, and the number of pageviews increased by 98%.

In 2002, readers from 139 countries visited *JOE*. For an alphabetical list of those countries and much more, visit [JOE Usage Statistics](#).

Editorial Review Rates

As you know, *JOE* employs a two-tiered review system. As editor, I review each submission to determine whether or not it is suitable to be sent out to our "blind" reviewers.

If it isn't, I return the submission to the author with (often substantive) revision suggestions. (See my April 2001 ["Editor's Page"](#) for some of the things I look for.)

In 2002, I:

- Rejected ~ 6% of submissions as unsuitable for *JOE*;
- Returned ~ 40% to authors for revision; and
- Accepted ~ 54% as suitable to be sent to reviewers (or, in the case of Commentary and Tools of the Trade articles, suitable for publication).

So much for the first tier.

"Blind" Review Rates

The second tier of the *JOE* review system involves our wonderful *JOE* reviewers. (I say "wonderful" based both on my own evaluation of their reviews and on the many complimentary comments I get about them from authors.)

Of the 2002 submissions that have been completely through the "blind" review process:

- ~ 8% have received an average rating of "Use Ideas & Start Over";
- ~ 20% have received a rating of "Major Revision Needed";
- ~ 57% have received a rating of "Minor Revision Needed"; and
- ~ 15% have been accepted for publication.

The two tiers in the *JOE* review system add up to a unique combination of academic rigor and professional development. *JOE* both "keeps the bar high" and helps authors get published.

JOE Needs Good Commentaries

Perhaps you noticed that the December 2002 *JOE* had no Commentary articles. This issue doesn't have any, either. *JOE* needs good Commentaries--and so does Extension.

Times are tough on the financial front. And it's difficult to avoid a "bunker mentality" when "retrenchment" seems to be the watchword. But this is when we need vision and challenge and passion the most.

What do I mean by "good Commentaries"? See the [JOE Submission Guidelines](#). I also talk about that in my August 2001 "[Editor's Page](#)", but showing is often more effective than telling:

- "[Value-Free Extension Education?](#)" and "[Extension: On the Brink of Extinction or Distinction?](#)" in the October 2000 *JOE*.
- "[Achieving Diversity and Pluralism: Our \(Sad\) Separatist Model](#)" and "[Facing Issues of Diversity: Rebirthing the Extension Service](#)" from December 2001.
- "[The Roles of Extension in Agricultural Economics Departments](#)" and "[Employee Participation in Decision Making in Extension: A Ladder of Participation to Reduce Cynicism](#)" from October 2002.

See what I'm talking about? If these Commentaries don't inspire you to comment on an issue of concern to Extension, to initiate discussion or debate, maybe the other 16 excellent and varied Commentaries published over the last 3 years will.

I've run out of space (and time) to talk about this issue of *JOE*, but the 24 fine articles speak for themselves.

Laura Hoelscher, Editor
joe-ed@joe.org

Copyright © by Extension Journal, Inc. ISSN 1077-5315. Articles appearing in the Journal become the property of the Journal. Single copies of articles may be reproduced in electronic or print form for use in educational or training activities. Inclusion of articles in other publications, electronic sources, or systematic large-scale distribution may be done only with prior electronic or written permission of the [Journal Editorial Office](#), joe-ed@joe.org.

If you have difficulties viewing or printing this page, please contact [JOE Technical Support](#)