

# editor's page

## Revised Manuscript Evaluation Criteria

On this page in the November/December, 1980 issue, I listed the criteria that our Editorial Committee members then used to evaluate manuscripts. Since then, that committee revised those criteria and added a definition for each. They continue to be classified into two sets—*content* and *readability*. Here they are.

### CONTENT CRITERIA

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Audience:       | Written primarily for Extension professionals involved in direct programming. |
| Focus:          | Central idea controls the entire manuscript.                                  |
| Development:    | Central idea is sufficiently, logically, and consistently presented.          |
| Usefulness:     | Helps Extension professionals improve their performance.                      |
| Importance:     | Makes significant contribution to the field of Extension education.           |
| Documentation:  | Cites references as necessary.  |
| Innovativeness: | Presents a new approach.  |
| Methodology:    | If based on research, the results are valid and reliable.                     |

### READABILITY CRITERIA

- |               |  |
|---------------|--|
| Clarity:      | Uses easy-to-understand language.  |
| Organization: | Appropriately sequences and constructs paragraphs and sentences to support the central idea. |
| Interest:     | Is a lively and imaginative presentation.  |
| Mechanics:    | Uses accepted standards of spelling and grammar.   |

The weighting of each specific criterion will vary depending on the nature of the manuscript. For example, methodology would be considered when evaluating a manuscript describing research.

It's obvious that these criteria have been developed specifically for the *Journal*. With minor adaptations, they should also be useful in evaluating most of our written communication.

