Review Criteria Updated

Every two years the Journal's Editorial Committee reviews the "Manuscript Evaluation Sheet," the guide used to review each manuscript submitted. In February, 1983, the committee reaffirmed the criteria currently being used, with minor modifications. These changes are italicized.

CONTENT CRITERIA
Audience: Written primarily for Extension educators involved in direct programming.
Focus: Central idea controls the entire manuscript.
Development: Central idea is sufficiently, logically, and consistently presented.
Usefulness: Helps Extension educators improve personally or programmatically.
Importance: Makes significant contributions to Extension education.
Documentation: Cites references as necessary.
Methodology: If based on research, enough information is provided to assure 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: Does presentation capture and hold readers' attention?
Mechanics: Uses acceptable standards of spelling and grammar.

Three committee members review each manuscript received. For each manuscript, the reviewer indicates how he/she would handle it. The alternatives include: publish, reject, publish with author revisions, reorganize and rewrite, utilize ideas and start over, consider for Idea Corner, or consider for Forum.

From July, 1981, to February, 1983, 247 manuscripts have been submitted for review. In addition, manuscripts are revised and resubmitted. A number of these revised ones are also reviewed. Few—very few—manuscripts are accepted after initial submission and review. Most are revised two, three, or four times.

My intent as editor is to select an array of manuscripts for publication among which every Extension staff member can find at least one idea in each issue. The Journal's purpose is to serve as a professional resource for ALL Extension educators.