

# The Journal of Extension

---

Volume 40 | Number 1

Article 1

---

2-1-2002

## Editor's Page

Laura Hoelscher

*Journal of Extension*, [joe-ed@joe.org](mailto:joe-ed@joe.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. (2002). Editor's Page. *The Journal of Extension*, 40(1), Article 1.  
<https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/joe/vol40/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](mailto:kokeefe@clemson.edu).



February 2002 // Volume 40 // Number 1



## Editor's Page

### Abstract

"*JOE* by the Numbers" reports how many submissions *JOE* received in 2001 and describes how they've fared in the review process. In that section you'll also find information on submission and readership rates. "Discussion Opportunity" waves the banner for the new *JOE* Discussion Forum. And "February 2002 *JOE*" highlights some of the topics discussed this month Extension involvement in public and possibly controversial issues most notable among them.

This issue's "Editor's Page" is more complicated than most. It's long; it has three major sections rather than the usual two; and the first of the sections deals with *JOE* numbers—and I *always* find numbers complicated.

### JOE by the Numbers

#### Submission & Readership Rates

2001 was a banner year for *JOE*. Authors submitted 212 articles last year, 30 more than in 2000 and 68 more than in 1999. In fact, submissions have increased more than 100% over the last 5 years (114%, to be exact). This means more and more of your colleagues are writing for *JOE*.

More and more people are reading it, too. In 2001, the *JOE* site had approximately 412,400 "visitors" who viewed 935,208 pages. We're talking increases of 372% and 255%, respectively, since 1998! (*JOE* is a really good journal, and the Web is growing really—really—fast.)

Many of those visitors have been subscribers (3,458), but others are now discovering the wealth of information available at [www.joe.org](http://www.joe.org) via popular Internet search engines like Yahoo and Google.

#### Editorial Review Rates

As you know, *JOE* now 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" <http://www.joe.org/joe/2001april/ed1.html> for some of the things I look for.)

In 2001, I:

Rejected ~ 8% of submissions as unsuitable for *JOE*;

Returned ~ 43% to authors for revision; and

Accepted ~ 48% 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 2001 submissions that have been completely through the "blind" review process:

- ~ 10% have received an average rating of "Use Ideas & Start Over";
- ~ 15% have received a rating of "Major Revision Needed";
- ~ 42% have received a rating of "Minor Revision Needed"; and
- ~ 32% 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.

### **Discussion Opportunity**

We had an encouraging (but not overwhelming) response to the *JOE* Discussion Forum feature that we unveiled in the Commentary articles in the December 2001 *JOE*. We've made some adjustments to give a bit more prominence to the threaded discussion opportunity in this issue's Commentary article.

Please take advantage of the opportunity to enter or start a new discussion with your Extension colleagues on the issues raised in "[Extension Faculty and Political Acumen.](#)"

Is the author suggesting that some Extension administrators don't do enough to prepare their Extension staff to move beyond the realm of providing "objective" and "factual information"? Is he right? Or do you believe it's inappropriate for Extension staff to become involved in public and possibly controversial issues?

### **February 2002 JOE**

Speaking of Extension and "public and possibly controversial issues," five of the articles in the February *JOE* address that topic in one way or another. Besides the Commentary, check out the first articles in the Features, Research in Brief, Ideas at Work, and Tools of the Trade categories.

Several other articles discuss diversity, the featured topic in last December's *JOE*. And evaluation receives its share of attention, as do agriculture, natural resources, and a host of other topics.

The February 2002 *JOE* has something for just about everyone.

Laura Hoelscher, Editor  
[joe-ed@joe.org](mailto: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](#)