

Summary of discussion of CJEAP and JEAJ held on Feb. 10, 2016

Attendance: Ken Brien, Jon Young, Robert Mizzi, Paul Newton, Shelley Scott, Donald Scott, Jackie Kirk, Gus Riveros.

CJEAP

Jon provided the following information related to CJEAP prior to the meeting:

Editorial Scope

CJEAP has a Canadian focus on topics relating to educational systems, administration, and policy. There are empirical and conceptual papers published with this focus. We do not accept manuscripts that are not about Canadian education systems - and currently don't have the capacity to review non-Canadian material. Our aim is to publish material from, and about, all provinces and territories.

Structure

The Educational Administration Area Group at the University of Manitoba functions as an editorial board. The journal has an Editor and Managing Editor and a national team of Reviewers. Since its inception in 1994 this journal has been housed at the University of Manitoba. It has always been an only electronic journal.

Resources

There is a stipend of around \$5,000 p.a. provided by the Faculty of Education for the Managing Editor who has always been a graduate student. The journal is housed on a U of M server. The editor's work is considered part of the "service" requirement for faculty members - there is no other workload consideration (i.e. course-release). There are approximately 70 reviewers associated with the journal.

Challenges

Framed as next steps for growth and future goals, the journal needs:

- 1) to be more sustainable, and examine a different governance model as well as a closer relationship with CASEA;
- 2) a technological update; and
- 3) to revisit the editorial structure to better represent the Canadian demographic.

Request from CASEA

- 1) Official affiliation with the association in order to expand reviewer base, authors, and range of topics. This would improve the chance for a successful SSHRC application to promote further next steps (bilingualism; building partners and web presence);
- 2) Editorial board representation; and
- 3) Annual space at the conference to promote the journal

During the meeting, Jon and Robert provided additional information:

15 – 20 articles published per year, 30 – 40% acceptance rate

Growth aims include becoming more Pan-Canadian (e.g., editorial board), bilingualism, special sections, practitioner representation. Desire to apply in next round of SSHRC funding expected in 2017.

JEAF

Paul provided the following information about JEAF prior to the meeting:

Scope:

Since 1986, the *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations* (JEAF) has been devoted to scholarly and critical works in the fields of educational administration, the philosophy of education, the sociology of education, the history of education, comparative education, and contemporary issues in education. It is a forum for articles addressing the administration of schools and higher education institutions, and the education of adult learners. Its uniqueness lies in its concern to foster work that integrates two or more of these areas of study.

The *Journal* accepts contributions from scholars, policy makers, graduate students, and researchers in education and related fields.

Structure:

Currently, there appears to be no structure for the journal. There was a highly esteemed editorial board in the past, but the journal now appears to be “orphaned”. The previous editorial board included international scholars such as Blackmore, Starratt, Ribbens, et al. alongside senior scholars from CASEA. Until recently, JEAF funding was still housed at the University of Alberta. This had now been remedied, and the U of S will be the sole host of JEAF for the foreseeable future.

Platform:

JEAF was moved to the OJS system a couple of years ago, and we are in the process of trying to regain control of the system. Right now, the previous editor is the only person who has full control over the site. We will need to either rebuild the site on OJS or pursue another format and venue for hosting the journal.

Resources:

When JEAF was moved to the OJS system, our main source of revenue (subscriptions) ceased. The Saskatchewan Educational Leadership Unit (SELU) provide approximately \$12,000 for journal operations. These funds were spent on graduate student assistantships. At this point, I do not have a clear commitment from SELU for continued support for the journal.

Challenges:

Unlike CJEAP, JEAF has had significant continuity issues over the past 20 years. As such, many of our challenges relate to decreased expectations of the journal and the lack of stability of JEAF. The following challenges are evident:

1. Similarly to CJEAP, JEAF needs to be associated in some manner with a stable entity. CASEA might be appropriate for this;
2. The mandate (and journal title) needs to be revisited. We have little to no profile with scholars in educational foundations. Is this something that we ought to seek to strengthen or should we refocus the journal on educational administration (We had been seeking someone to edit special

issue of JEAF focused on exploring the relationship between educational administration and educational foundations)?

3. We need to rebuild the confidence in the journal. Currently, there appears to be limited interest from authors in JEAF as an outlet for their work. We have temporarily dealt with this by establishing 2 special issues while we rebuild internet/confidence in JEAF;

4. We need to establish a stable point of contact for authors and reviewers. We have been using graduate student assistants, but they are temporary, and this may not be ideal with respect to continuity; and

5. Once we stabilize the journal, we need to consider impact factors, indexing (web of science), and, eventually, SSHRC journal funding.

Paul provided additional information during the meeting: Serious lack of submissions, access problems with the OJS system, some connections with international scholars, uncertain ownership of journal. Working with Saskatchewan Educational Leadership Unit (SELU) to publish some applied research in a practitioner venue.

Discussion summary

Copy editing is done by the managing editor at CJEP as part of his tasks. JEAF is using a graduate student for this. Restrictions associated with word count in some journals are an artifact of the print journal era. Online publication allows for more interactive or video content.

What is the place and understanding of educational foundations for the purpose of both journals? Discussion of past and current understandings and implications for both journals, especially JEAF's currently stated desire to publish articles that integrate two or more areas of study. CJEP has a stated focus on Canadian content, which does pose a problem for conceptual pieces. JEAF accepts articles with international content. Paul commented on the lack of speculative work in international educational administration journals. Shelley commented on the push for applied content in Alberta. Ken reported that he had heard that the Education & Law Journal (edited by Greg Dickinson at UWO) had been shut down by Carswell and that authors writing about legal issues in education may be looking for another suitable publication venue.

Ken noted that CAFE does not have a journal, but its president Kurt Clausen is editor of the Canadian Journal of Action Research. Other CSSE affiliates with journals include CCGSE, CACS, and CIESC. CASEA has an existing relationship with CSSE (CJE) and with CCEAM (ISEA).

Open access publishing has resulted in the loss of subscription revenue for JEAF. What are the implications for this type of publishing? Author fees?

Encouragement for authors of CASEA papers to submit articles to CJEP and JEAF. We could include a statement in the acceptance letter. We could host a CJEP/JEAF session at the conference with presenters being required to come with full papers. The journals could host a graduate student session to show how to prepare their work for publication. We could make a point of encouraging doctoral students to publish in one of these journals.

CASEA could include an executive position (or appoint a committee) specifically for liaison with the journals.

Options for Paul, Bonnie, Jon, and Robert to continue the conversation: each journal has a formal affiliation with CASEA, each journal has a similar look but separate entities (similar to EMAL and MIE at BELMAS), create a completely new entity to replace the two journals.

Plan for a report to CASEA and time at 2016 AGM.

Hi, Ken.

I'm sorry I wasn't able to attend the meeting the other day. The following are some of my thoughts based on your summary here (and given the limitations of my understanding of the issues). I hope the ideas are useful, but I realize I may be going over well-trodden ground. Please feel free to use my comments (or not) as you see fit.

Kind regards,
Cathy

Issues to consider going forward:

According to Katy Ellsworth, who was tasked with the responsibility of facilitating the transition for CJE, some of the challenges facing academic journals today include:

- changed journal operations as a result of the transition to the Open Journal System;
- Universities, education faculties, and senior appointments committees that are becoming more concerned with journal impact factors;
- Knowledge mobilization, particularly the dissemination of knowledge beyond the academy, as an increasingly important goal.

Like CJE, it's necessary to consider a coherent business model for the journals.

Communications, marketing, operations, and personnel need to be aligned and organized so that the journals are sustainable and can function. Before moving forward with any changes, though, I think it's essential to find out if CASEA membership will support one or both journals, as well as to revisit and possibly refine the journals' mandates and policies. In reviewing CJE's mandate and policies, the editorial board considered questions similar the ones I'm listing below that might apply to CJEP and JEPF:

- Does the mandate need refining?
- If JEPF broadens its scope through the removal of foundations as a focus, what are the implications for a generalist journal? For example: if JEPF receives a manuscript that is excellent, but so specialized that its language is too technical for a general audience, then should the article be rejected? For CJEP, is the focus too narrow (i.e., Canadian contexts and issues related to policy), such that readership is limited, and if so, could the journal broaden its scope in some way?
- For both journals, what is the interest in studies conducted outside of Canada or studies using foreign data? If there is relevance to the Canadian context, could a case be made for the inclusion of such an article? Currently, I believe the current answer is yes for JEPF, but no for CJEP. Might CJEP be willing to consider this issue? It might broaden the submission pool as well as

readership.

- For the inclusion of French language articles, there may be issues around originality. At CJE, an author submitted an article in English, noting that it had previously been published in French. He had paid to have it translated, and then submitted it to CJE. CJE rejected the article as being unoriginal. How might JEAF and CJEP handle such an issue?

Communications and Marketing: Some of the confidence and readership issues noted may have to do with communications and marketing.

Communications: Lessons learned from CJE reinforce the importance of editorial responsiveness (see comments in the Operations section) in promoting confidence and encouraging submissions. An electronic system set up to alert editors when there has been a submission would be ideal, as well as automatic notifications to authors that their submission was received. A system that authors could log into to see their manuscript's status (in review, reviewed with comments, acceptance status), as well as to upload revised copies would also be ideal. I'm not an expert on OJS, but CJE's experiences would indicate that this is all possible, and there is tech support available (from where, I don't know). I think JEAF is on its way with this, but I'm not sure about CJEP.

Marketing: It would be a good idea to come up with marketing goals for both journals. Katy generated the following preliminary list as a framework for some marketing goals for CJE:

- Attracting submissions from top tier scholars
- Increasing international readership
- Increasing readership among early career scholars
- Increasing French-language submissions and therefore readership
- Increasing the journals' H-index and other journal impact factors

Some of these goals (with exception of international readership) may also impact CJEP's reported sustainability challenge. Impact factors and journal prestige are increasingly important to universities and scholars, so working toward enhancing the journals' impact is important. Similarly, the acceptance rate can be used to assess a journal's prestige, and more selective journals are preferred. Is a 30-40% rate selective enough for CJEP and JEAF? What about a 25% rate (which is CJE's rate) or a 20% rate?

It's clear that JEAF welcomes submissions from policy makers, academics, students, etc. but I wasn't sure about CJEP. Also, I wasn't sure if a variety of submission types was welcomed. Diversifying the types of submissions the journals publish might broaden readership. Empirical articles, theoretical articles, book reviews, editorials, essays, sets of point-counterpoint articles or debates on relevant issues, etc. may all be possibilities.

In order to enhance readership among early career scholars (and hopefully retain them throughout their careers), it is likely important to support early career scholars' work, while not potentially lowering the quality of the journal articles published. (This tension is likely already acknowledged by JEAF, given their mandate to publish articles from students, etc.) CJE is considering publishing a small number of articles (perhaps one or two) in a section that is exclusively for early career scholars. Perhaps this is something CJEP might consider (and possibly JEAF, if they don't already).

Similarly, it might be a good idea to consider practitioners' perspectives and publish their articles as well. CJE has wrestled with this issue and the inherent tensions: it is important to

share research across multiple groups (including practitioners in the field), but some people are concerned that making research practical and accessible contravenes CJE's mandate as a vehicle for scholarly research. This all relates to knowledge mobilization, which has become increasingly important (for example, SSHRC expects a well articulated knowledge mobilization plan for any proposals they fund).

These are some questions CJE is asking, according to Katy:

- Could we offer a special section such as “Research into Practice” or “Field Notes”?
- Another way of mobilizing knowledge might be through marketing specific articles. For example,

we could send abstracts and URLs on topics of relevance to publications for school superintendents, principals' and vice-principal's associations, and so on.

Publicity and acquisitions – publicity/promotion is part of marketing (one of the 4 Ps: product, place, promotion and price)

As of 2015, CJE is working to build its profile at the CSSE conference, through the Journal Editors' Panel, through the Facebook page (which features the CJE authors presenting at the conference), and through Twitter, which is also publicizing CJE authors presenting at the conference. Similarly, if JEAF and CJEAP become affiliated with CASEA, they could be promoted through CASEA's site and perhaps even by CSSE at the conference. The Journal Editors' Panel is a partnership among the McGill Journal of Education, JCACS, and the CJE. The panel at Congress is being hosted by Dr. John Willinsky, and focuses on the theme “What role do journals play in mobilizing knowledge as a public good?” The panel was followed by a “meet the editors” wine & cheese reception. The aim was to be able to acquire some new manuscripts through this event. If JEAF and CJEAP are affiliated with CASEA, it might be possible to acquire new manuscripts through a similar event, perhaps as part of our CASEA reception or AGM.

In order to acquire contributions in specific areas or ones from specific authors, CJE asked association presidents to suggest names of key scholars who might wish to submit articles for consideration, and the CJE editorial team contacted these scholars with a friendly, open-ended email, asking them to consider the CJE as a publication venue. Similarly, CASEA members could recommend contributors to the editorial teams at JEAF and CJEAP. It might also be interesting to use the journals almost as monographs, encouraging CASEA presenters at the conference to submit their finished manuscripts to the journals for publication. The editors could reach out to specific scholars at the conference presentation sessions, or presenters could approach the editors on their own.

Operations and Personnel: Resources and structural issues impact both operations and personnel.

1) Human resources

a) reviewer pool

CJEAP reports that they have 70 reviewers on the books, but there is a desire for more reviewers. I wonder if all 70 people are current reviewers. CJE found that their reviewer pool was stale; there were many people listed as reviewers who never did any reviews. Journals often publish their list of editorial board members. Being on a journal's editorial board is a fairly prestigious position to include on a professional cv and should theoretically be an appealing

position. According to Katy Ellsworth, the Canadian Association of Learned Journals' Best Practices Guide describes the role of editorial board members as follows [to]:

- advise the journal's editor on matters of editorial policy, strategy, and style (e.g., suggesting editorial directions to be developed; balancing topics within an issue; advising on new approaches, article series, additional features, and how to attract the best articles)
- referee articles and suggest suitable reviewers
- encourage scholars to submit suitable articles or advise editor on scholars who might be approached
- suggest ideas for promotion of the journal and provide access to useful mailing lists
- show support for the journal and lend it "respectability"
- ensure the journal reflects the needs and interests of the society, if relevant
- help to select and appoint future editors.

In reality, editorial board members often function mostly as reviewers and as liaisons to link the editors with high quality reviewers (i.e. board members' colleagues). For example, in the past, the CJE managing editor would send out a list of manuscript titles to all editorial board members, and ask if each board member could review one or more manuscripts and/or recommend a colleague who was working in the particular area addressed in the manuscript. CJE now has an editorial panel that is tasked specifically with the job of recommending reviewers for submitted manuscripts. If CASEA were to vote to support CJEAP and JEAF, it might be a good idea to include association members in an editorial board (not necessarily a separate editorial panel like CJE's) that would serve the functions listed above. I believe this is what CJEAP wants, as indicated in the text above. JEAF might also consider this strategy, if it hasn't already. This strategy would strengthen the members' ownership and support of the journals, and may help to ensure that the journals have a robust group of reviewers.

b) editorial staff

I'm not clear about the structures currently in place at CJEAP and JEAF, so I'll talk a little about CJE's experiences. According to Katy Ellsworth, CJE is "moving toward professionalizing some of the roles, and will likely need additional human and financial resources. For example, the previous managing editor was a graduate student who worked part-time for the journal. She did all the copyediting and layout of articles, as well as author communications and database management." This may also be the case with CJEAP and JEAF, as they also have grad students functioning in an editorial capacity. In 2014, the managing editor (Katy Ellsworth) hired a communications firm to do copyediting and layout, which eliminated the need for a grad student to function in this capacity. The cost of the copyediting and layout was about \$750 per article, depending on complexity. As well, "CSSE is considering hiring a permanent part-time Managing Editor to oversee operations. This hire would allow the editor and rédactrice to focus on editorial matters, marketing, and so on."

It may be possible for CJEAP and JEAF to have an editor (e.g., overseeing the journal mandate, ensuring academic quality of journal publications), managing editor (e.g., overseeing operations such as communication systems between journal and authors, the process from submission to publication, coordinating the work of editorial assistants), and editorial assistants (possibly students employed to correspond with authors, do layout and copy editing, etc.). This personnel would be doubled if there were to be a French-language component (unless all editorial staff were bilingual). That said, personnel will come with a cost, which currently might not be affordable for the journals. (Please see comments below.)

2) Financial resources

All of these elements require financing, in order to sustain the journals. Several options that CJE is considering are:

- a) **Article processing fees.** In most cases, authors will be able to draw on their research funds to cover these fees—a practice that is allowed by the tri-council granting agencies. Article processing fees are becoming more common, even among open access journals, perhaps because they publish articles more quickly than conventional journals in some cases. As an illustration of the money that could be generated, CJE received over 200 submissions in 2013, which at \$100 per submission would yield \$20,000.
- b) **Fee-based publishing.** We could charge the authors of accepted articles a fee for copyediting and layout. This would be revenue-neutral for the journals. At present, grad students are doing the copyediting, and are paid a stipend, which would be covered by this fee. This strategy would also allow for a copyediting service to be employed with limited (but some) costs incurred by the journals (see comments above).
- c) **HTML publishing.** CJE articles are laid out in a desktop publishing program and placed online as PDF documents. The final appearance is very similar to a print publication. This may also be the case for CJEP and JEP. A switch to HTML-only publishing would mean that the journals could eliminate the cost of desktop publishing, or professional layout costs.
- d) **Link submissions to CASEA membership.** It may be the case that many of the submissions to the journals come from non-members. We could require authors to become members before they can upload a submission. A portion of the CASEA fee could be directed to the journals.
- e) **Increase CASEA membership fees.** I don't know when the last fee increase was. If there's one planned, perhaps a portion of any planned increase could be allocated to the journals.

CJEP wishes to seek SSHRC funding, which is a good idea. JEP might also consider doing so, in order to supplement any money received from the university. As noted by Paul, there isn't guaranteed funding from the institution, and some consistent funding is necessary for sustainability.

Operations (and policy) structures

Although the situation with CJEP and JEP may not be the same as CJE's, I think CJE's experiences may be informative, even as a cautionary tale. In 2013, CJE's "article queue was completely bogged down", according to Katy Ellsworth. "There was no model to show how manuscripts flowed through the system. No one was checking manuscripts to ensure that they were being screened and reviewed. More than a few articles were published without two blind peer reviews. Authors complained that they were receiving no communication from CJE. The journal had manuscripts in the database dating from 2011." This situation served to erode confidence in the journal, and damaged its reputation.

According to Katy, "it became clear that there is no mechanism for oversight, no reporting structure, no description of roles and responsibilities, and no operations manual. The CSSE Board is now functioning as an overseeing body. What this means in practical terms is that the editor and the rédactrice must submit an annual report to the CSSE Board. The report should outline manuscript status since the previous year's report: how many manuscripts were accepted; accepted with revisions; in revision; declined; and how many are still in review; how many weeks, on average, manuscripts spent in review; and for any manuscripts from the previous year's reporting cycle, figures on how many manuscripts are still unresolved. The report should

also include a discussion of editorial direction, some notes on consultations with the CJE Board, and a description of marketing activities and innovations tried over the past year. The CSSE Board will respect editorial autonomy.” If CJEAP and JEAF were to partner with CASEA, perhaps the relationship could function much as CJE’s with CSSE.

At any rate, these are just some thoughts or considerations for CASEA as well as the journals, as well as some strategies for moving forward. Please let me know if you have any questions.