Expenses this year came in $106,000+ under budget, but book sales—though stronger than last year— were lower than hoped, resulting in a total program deficit of $383,216.

We continue to receive a steady flow of book proposal submissions (around 2-3 per month), though our total acceptance rate remains under 10%.

We continue to offer PDF ebook versions of all new titles and of several older ones.

Promotional Efforts

Marketing efforts this year included targeted email promotions; the annual catalog; themed print fliers; highlighting of titles in the weekly INBOX newsletter, section-level NOW messages, and the Literacy and NCTE blog; social media outreach (Twitter, Facebook); and visibility through the NCTE Online Store. We continue to partner with Amazon.com to ensure that NCTE titles are available through the online retailer.

NCTE book authors continue to be deeply involved in other Council activities and services. Our authors
- create lessons for the very popular ReadWriteThink website (www.readwritethink.org), many of which are tied to their book publications
- frequently publish in journals produced by NCTE and others
- appear in interviews on Education Talk Radio
- provide professional learning opportunities through Web seminars (available through the NCTE Online Store in On Demand archived form after the live event) and online courses

Editorial Board

New members welcomed to the Board this year were Deborah Dean (Teacher Education), Anne Elrod Whitney (Research), and Bruce McComiskey (College). They joined the other members of the Board: Vivian Vasquez (Elementary); Jamal Cooks (Middle); Ken Lindblom and Amy Magnafichi Lucas (Secondary); and Duane Roen (College).

The terms of members Vivian Vasquez, Jamal Cooks, and Ken Lindblom will end after the 2016 Annual Convention. As always, we are indebted to the members of the Board for their dedication. They generously give of their time and of their scholarship, serving the Council by articulating a strategic vision for the Books Program in fiscally and educationally challenging times.


Structural Kindness: Essays on Literacy Education in Honor of Kent D. Williamson, edited by Darren Cambridge and Patricia Lambert Stock

Studies in Writing & Rhetoric (SWR) series (series editor through June 2016: Victor Villanueva)

The Desire for Literacy: Writing in the Lives of Adult Learners, Lauren Rosenberg


From Boys to Men: Rhetorics of Emergent American Masculinity, Leigh Ann Jones

NCTE-Routledge Research Series (series editors: Valerie Kinloch and Susi Long)
Language, Culture, Identity, and Citizenship in College Classrooms and Communities, Juan C. Guerra

Cultivating Racial and Linguistic Diversity in Literacy Teacher Education: Teachers Like Me, Marcelle M. Haddix

Co-publication with Free Spirit Press

Making Curriculum Pop: Developing Literacies in All Content Areas, Pam Goble and Ryan R. Goble

Kurt Austin, NCTE Publications Director
College Composition and Communication (CCC)

College Composition and Communication (http://www.ncte.org/cccc/ccc/) publishes research and scholarship in rhetoric and composition studies that supports college teachers in reflecting on and improving their practices in teaching writing and that reflects the most current scholarship and theory in the field. The field of composition studies draws on research and theories from a broad range of humanistic disciplines—English studies, rhetoric, cultural studies, gay studies, gender studies, critical theory, education, technology studies, race studies, communication, philosophy of language, anthropology, sociology, and others—and from within composition and rhetoric studies, where a number of subfields have also developed, such as technical communication, computers and composition, writing across the curriculum, research practices, and the history of these fields.

Current Activities
In my second year as editor of the flagship journal of our field, we have continued to publish a mix of articles and review essays in addition to the routine annual offerings (e.g., the CCCC Chair’s Address and Letter). Our acceptance rate, including peer reviewed but pre-screened and invited submissions is about 20%. I can already tell that this percentage will be dropping due to the flood of material we received this summer and the large number of rejections we sent out. For work we do publish, every article goes through two rounds of anonymous peer review, with at least one, and often more than one, round of revision before publication.

We also have some special features, including a collection of literacy narratives—something new with my editorship. And we just published (September 2016) our special issue on “The Political Economies of Composition Studies,” which has generated much buzz in the field (as I judge from various social media and private correspondence). We are also inviting published contributors to submit short videos discussing the origins and writing of their articles, and we have already put online (on the official CCC site through NCTE) podcast interviews with some of our authors.

As editor, I have made numerous presentations at various conferences across the country about the journal, and I am pleased to represent CCCC/NCTE in this capacity. We are now in the process of planning our next special issue, “The Public Work of Composition Studies,” whose call for papers was vetted by the full editorial board.

Submissions

Submission Data at a Glance
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submissions and Statuses:</th>
<th>178</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Made:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Submission (130)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept Conditionally:</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit:</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected after Review:</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk Rejected:</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After First Revision (36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept Conditionally:</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject:</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Second Revision (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept:</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Third Revision (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending Submissions:</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Decisions/Submissions:</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Statistics
**Review Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Reviewers Utilized</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Reviewers Utilized</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Days to Complete Review</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Early Reviews</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of Days Early</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Late Reviews</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of Days Late</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer “Accept” Recommendation Rate</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround Time (Average, in Days)</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate (New)</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate (Revised)</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate (Overall)</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editorial Board**

Here are current and continuing members of our twenty-member editorial board:

**CCC Editorial Board (effective March 2016)**

- Linda Adler-Kassner, University of California, Santa Barbara (2014-2016)
- Barbara Bird, Taylor University (2014-2016)
- Scott Lloyd DeWitt, Ohio State University (2014-2016)
- Cinthia Gannett, Fairfield University (2014-2016)
- Anne Herrington, University of Massachusetts, Amherst (2014-2016)
- Maria Jerskey, LaGuardia Community College (2014-2016)
- Jim Kalmbach, Illinois State University (2014-2016)
- Kevin Roozen, University of Central Florida (2014-2016)
- Carol Rutz, Carleton College (2014-2016) (RENEW)
- Raúl Sánchez, University of Florida (2014-2016)
- Patrick Sullivan, Manchester Community College (2014-2016)
- Sheila Carter Tod, Virginia Tech (2014-2016)

Herrington and Kalmbach have retired and wish to step down from their positions on the editorial board. I have asked remaining members to continue on for another year so as not to result in a flood of new members.

- Paula Mathieu, Boston College (2015-2017)
- LuMing Mao, Miami University (2015-2017)
- Tobi Jacobi: Colorado State University (2016-2018)
- Vorris Nunley: University of California, Riverside (2016-2018)
- Octavio Pimentel: Texas State University (2016-2018)

I am in the processing of asking the following folks if they would consent to a three-year term on our editorial board, and I ask the CCC Executive Committee to approve these potential new members.
Chase Bollig, Assistant Professor of English at Gonzaga University, whose work focuses on rhetoric, composition, literacy, and working class studies.

Nancy Welch, Professor of English at the University of Vermont, whose work focuses on composition and rhetoric, rhetoric of social movements, women and rhetoric, fiction and nonfiction writing, and literacy studies.

In sum, I think we are on track to continue producing and publishing a high-quality journal that speaks volumes (pun intended!) about the originality, depth, and rigor of research in composition studies.

Jonathan Alexander, Editor
This is my final report as editor, as I enter my final year ready to transition out fully in July 2017. At that time, I will hand over the reins to Professor Melissa Ianetta of the University of Delaware, who is already transitioning into the position, reading manuscripts and assigning reviewers for future issues as of August 1, 2016. Her first issue as editor will be September 2017.

For this final report, I’ll thus provide a somewhat abbreviated of my usual findings, since the time period under review is shorter and my work mostly complete. I’m using the EM statistics generated for the period July 1st, 2015 to April 1st, 2016—the latter date being when we stopped reading and accepting submissions in anticipation of Melissa’s term beginning, and secondary to a slate of already-full issues for the remainder of my term. In short, I stopped reading in April to avoid any backlog or misunderstandings about work in the queue from editor to editor. Please note that these EM stats may not fully represent work already in the pipeline prior to this time but that we later accepted, or reviews already assigned which landed or were completed during this time. Keeping this condition in mind accounts for what appears to me to be a fairly low number of submissions. What can also account for this lower number than usual is the knowledge on the part of many potential authors that I was transitioning out, and that remaining space in the issues was limited. In sum, submissions slowed almost to a halt by March 2016, and were turned away starting April 2016 (or allowed to sit in the queue until August 1st—which some authors opted for, to my surprise).

According to EM, we reviewed 86 manuscripts for consideration during this period, though this includes 26 manuscripts “not yet assigned,” which I cannot account for. I’m not sure if that might include the above authors who chose to sit in the queue until reviewing opened again in August. Of the 69 unique reviewers who agreed to read manuscripts for us this past year (22 invited reviewers declined, and the invitation for one additional was terminated), the average number of days to complete an assigned review was 26.6. The average time from submission of a manuscript to reviewer assignment was 4.6 days, and the average time from the submission of a manuscript to a final decision on that manuscript was 49.3 days for revise and resubmit, 14 days for reject, and 50.7 days for accept conditionally (only 3 MSS in this latter category total). As for total reviewers working on any manuscript review during this time period, we employed 92 unique individuals.

Of the 65 manuscripts for which I made a final decision during this period, 51 were rejected, 35 of which without being sent out for review, while 10 of the 16 that were sent out for review received a decision of revise and resubmit. Of those sent out for revision, a total of 4 manuscripts were accepted for publication from this set of submissions during this time period. Included in these 10 R and R decisions were two additional authors to revise and resubmit, but who declined to do so. I believe additional MSS from the 10 in R and R were also accepted, but not included in these calculated stats via EM.

As I’ve noted in the past (specifically, last year’s report), there seems to be a gap developing between wholly unsuitable or out-of-scope MSS that do not go out for review and high-quality work that is reviewed, and receives very favorable reviews from the readers. There is far less than desirable in the typical “middle.” I hope this trend does not continue into the submission pool for Professor Ianetta’s forthcoming issues, as I find it troubling, to say the least. I wonder if this is the situation at other field journals presently; anecdotal evidence from fellow editors would indicate so, but I do not have anything firmer than that to cite here.

As noted above, all my remaining issues for Volume 29 are filled and some have already appeared. Of those forthcoming as of the NCTE annual meeting in late November, where this report will be read, we have:
January 2017:
This issue features work by John Duffy, Michael DePalma, and Heather Thomson-Bunn, centering on religion, ethics, virtue, and citizenship, particularly for students in writing courses. Though it was not designed as a special issue, these articles came together nicely to complement one another. This issue also includes a review essay by Brenda Brueggemann.

March 2017:
Our March issue includes articles by Anne Ruggles Gere and co-authors, Amy Lueck, and Aubrey Sciavone, on transfer student difficulties in writing courses, 19th and early 20th century student yearbooks and historiographic views of literacy and agency, and recent writing textbooks’ sometimes paradoxical coverage of and directives for teachers regarding multimodal writing assignments. This issue concludes with a review essay by Kirk Branch.

May 2017:
This is a special issue on English studies, rhetoric, and leadership guest-edited by Tom Miller and Joddy Murray. It includes at present four feature articles, some of which are in the final stages of development, and an afterword on the general topic by Miller.

July 2017:
My last issue as editor will feature the recent TYCA statement on graduate training for work in two year colleges, plus an accompanying historically-focused essay on this topic by Darin Jensen and Christie Toth. It also includes an article by Beth Godbee on epistemic justice and agency in writing conferences/consultations, and another article by Collin Craig on black queer rhetorics in young male college-age authors. I also plan to write an extended intro for this issue that serves to reflect in some measure on the trends and themes I have seen in our pages since 2012, as outgoing editor of CE.

In closing, I want to say what a privilege and honor it has been to serve as editor of College English for these past five years. I learned much not only about editing and publishing, but also about the fine work being done in our field, and the importance of cultivating and spotlighting it in our publications. I also learned a great deal about the importance of sound and humane editorial feedback; timely publishing processes; and generally, open and clear communication between authors, editors, reviewers, and other stakeholders. I am grateful to the team at Headquarters, chief among those Kurt Austin, who helped me in numerous ways as I navigated the editorial process, and to the reviewers, authors, and readers who made my issues of CE what they were. I am thankful to have been afforded this professional opportunity by the members of the CSSC, and NCTE. My best wishes to all for your work in the coming year.

Kelly Ritter, Editor
First, a brief overview of the journal’s statistics: We received 60 new manuscripts between July 1, 2015, and June 30, 2016—a little more than one per week. The average time between submission and initial decision letter (whether that be “reject,” “revise and resubmit,” or “conditionally accept”—there were no acceptances upon initial submission) was just over two months. Our acceptance rate was 10-15%. These statistics are consistent with the first year of our editorial term and in keeping with our goals of reasonably prompt feedback and maintaining the rigor and quality of the journal.

Second, highlights of the year’s accomplishments: I am proudest of the publication of our first themed issue (though the publication date—July 2016—falls just outside the FY, the heavy lifting that went into it spanned January-June), titled Black Girls’ Literacies. It is groundbreaking in its content and focus, and it also represents our commitment to elevating both the concerns of and scholars representing students of color. I’m also really pleased with how our Provocateur Pieces section has opened up creative opportunities for authors and has, I think, generated some excitement among our readership.

Third, plans for the future: Our second themed issue, titled From Racial Violence to Racial Justice: Praxis and Implications for English [Teacher] Education, is due to come out in January 2017. It extends the aforementioned commitment and also primarily features emerging scholars of color, which is intentional, reflecting my belief that mentoring and supporting such scholars is an important part of my role as editor. However, a significant increase in the quality of initial submissions of late is resulting in some tension around that aspect of my role: I have to be more discriminating in what I send out for external review, and I also have less time to dedicate to anything outside the essentials of production as sole editor. But an abundance of high-quality submissions is a good problem to have, and so far I’m managing okay.

I also would like to see what we (both the editorial team, which now includes Shea Kerkhoff as Assistant Editor, and NCTE writ large) can do to document and increase the journal’s impact beyond the scope of our readership.

Tara Star Johnson, Editor
English Journal (EJ)

English Journal (http://www.ncte.org/journals/ej) is a journal of ideas for English language arts teachers in junior and senior high schools and middle schools. EJ presents information on the teaching of writing and reading, literature, and language. Each issue examines the relationship of theory and research to classroom practice in the teaching of English. English Journal is published bimonthly - September, November, January, March, May, and July.

Editorial Team

The editorial team consists of co-editors Julie Gorlewski and David Gorlewski (both were assistant professors at the State University of New York at New Paltz during the production of Volume 105. Since July, 2016, Julie has been serving as an Associate Professor and the Chair of the Teaching and Learning Department at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, Virginia); Theresa Kay, senior editorial associate operating out of Fairbanks, Alaska; and two editorial associates John Mazzone and Steve Wagner (graduate students from SUNY New Paltz). In addition, NCTE production assistant Rona Smith provides expert assistance in preparing the journal for final publication. Finally, members of the Secondary Steering Section contribute theme-based introductory articles in each issue under the heading of High School Matters.

Writers and Published Manuscripts

The co-editors have access to an online manuscript submission and peer review system for scholarly publications called Editorial Manager (EM). Data from EM indicated that there were 295 manuscript submissions to English Journal from November 16, 2014 through November 15, 2015 (which was the submission deadline for volume 105.1). From these submissions, 66 peer reviewed articles were selected for publication. Of that group, 45 articles had first authors who were college or university faculty. Of the remaining 21 articles, 18 had first authors who were either middle school or high school classroom teachers, and 3 were former classroom teachers.

Those numbers do not include the regular columns (which are discussed in the next section). Given the number of submissions and the number of articles accepted for publication, Volume 105 of English Journal had an acceptance rate of 22%.

Columns and Columnists

Volume 105 continued the English Journal tradition of including columns under the following titles and with the following editors:

- A Thousand Writers: Voices of the National Writing Project – Tanya Baker
- Carpe Librum: Seize the (YA) Book - Pauline Skowron-Schmidt
- Continuous Becoming: Moving Toward Mastery – Victoria P. Hankey
- Disabling Assumptions – Patricia A. Dunn
- Lingua Anglia: Bridging Language and Learners – Pamela J. Hickey
- Soft(a)ware in the English Classroom – Tom Liam Lynch
- Speaking Truth to Power – P.L. Thomas & Christian Z. Goering
- Under Discussion: Teaching Speaking and Listening – Lisa Barker
- Book Reviews – Ken Lindblom

Issue Themes and Content

Of the six issues that comprise Volume 105, five had specific themes. These included:

- 105.1 (Gifted or Special: Perpetuating the Mis-measure of Student, guest edited by sj Miller)
- 105.2 (Rethinking Research: Cultivating Inquiry in the English Classroom)
- 105.3 (Reading, Writing, and Relationships: Centering on Learners)
105.4 (Reflections and Echoes: Nonfiction in English Classrooms)
105.5 (Imagination, Creativity, and Innovation: Showcasing the “A” in English Language Arts, guest edited by Toby Emert, Katherine Macro, and Pauline Skowron Schmidt)
105.6 was a General Interest issue.

Each issue in Volume 105 included a From the Editors section and each included a High School Matters column. In all, volume 105 consisted of:

- 66 articles
- 22 poems
- 39 columns
- 2 “EJ in Focus”
- 1 “Speaking My Mind”

**Poetry**

The poetry that appears in EJ is also a part of the blind review process. The editor of the poetry section is Nancy C. Krim. The topics and emotions explored in the poems are often related to the respective issue’s theme.

**Blind Reviewing Process**

EJ is refereed by peer reviewers from both the United States and Canada. Reviewers consist primarily of college faculty members and middle and high school English teachers, as well as ELA consultants and librarians. The new editorial team has continued the practice of publishing the names of all reviewers in the July issue.

**English Journal Writing Awards**

The Paul and Kate Farmer Awards are given to authors of the best articles published in the journal during the previous volume year. Eligible entrants must be secondary school teachers and may include those on leave or not currently teaching. This year’s selection committee was chaired by Caitlin Murphy with members Janis Mottern-High, Courtney Morgan, Sarah Fletcher, and Janet Atkins.

The 2016 award recipients were:


The Edwin M. Hopkins Award is named after the author of the lead article in the first issue of the journal. Edwin M. Hopkins was a professor of rhetoric and English language at the University of Kansas, a member of the first Board of Directors of NCTE, and co-author of the first NCTE constitution. The purpose of the award is to recognize outstanding English Journal articles written by someone who does not qualify for the Farmer Award. Recipients are generally from higher education.

The selection committee was chaired by Christian Z. Goering with committee members Ann Quinlan, Lawrence Butti, and Katie Green.

The 2016 recipient was:

Honorable Mention went to:

- Donna L. Miller, Aaniiih Nakoda College, Harlem, Montana, for *Cultivating Creativity* which appeared in Volume 104.6, July, 2015.
- Amy Maupin, Transylvania University, Lexington, Kentucky, for *From the Scroll to the Screen: Why Letters, Then and Now, Matter* which appeared in Volume 105.4, March, 2016.

**A Final Note**

As noted earlier, Volume 105 included two issues with guest editors: 105.1, *Gifted or Special: Perpetuating the Mis-measure of Student*, guest edited by sj Miller; and 105.5, *Imagination, Creativity, and Innovation: Showcasing the “A” in English Language Arts*, guest edited by Toby Emert, Katherine Macro, and Pauline Skowron Schmidt.

Though the inclusion of guest editors entails additional work on our part, we believe that the practice taps into the unique expertise and experiences of educators, and offers *EJ* readers topics and discussions of greater variety, depth and focus. We plan to continue this practice if and when unique situations present themselves.

*Julie A. Gorlewski and David A. Gorlewski, Co-Editors*
English Leadership Quarterly (ELQ) is a publication of the Conference on English Leadership (CEL), and helps department chairs, K-12 supervisors, and other leaders in their role of improving the quality of English instruction. ELQ offers short articles on a variety of issues important to decision makers in the English language arts. (Published August, October, February, and April)

“Voice and Choice” (August 2015): This issue was the first to require submission via Google Docs. Editorial board members assisted with review of submissions. Of note in this issue is the manuscript by Elaine Simos (“Genius Hour: Critical Inquiry and Differentiation”). This was the free access article that was shared via Twitter, and one that I would also show future authors to give a sense of how to embed sources and edit down manuscripts.

“Getting Into Arguments” (October 2015): This issue contains the ELQ Best Article award winner, Christina Saidy’s “Moving from Them to Us: Making New Arguments About Teaching and Learning Via Teacher Inquiry.” By telling one teacher’s story of professional growth, Saidy explores the power of effective teacher inquiry groups. Through her collaboration and research with a school in an urban Southwest community, Saidy describes how one teacher’s shift from a deficit mindset to a growth and activist mindset benefited the students in his school. Given “access to specific writing exercises, writing environments, research strategies, and collaborative activities,” participants in Saidy’s inquiry group were able “to think critically and respond actively to perceived questions or problems in their teaching and professional lives.”

“Teacher Leadership” (February 2016): With a grand total of eight pieces, this issue offered readers abundant perspectives on the topic of teacher leadership. Manuscripts embedded a variety of sources and links to external articles and artifacts. This was the first issue to feature an infographic.

“Digital Dilemmas and Delights” (April 2016): This issue received a smaller number of submissions and was a shorter issue as a result. The issue theme was suggested by Rebecca Sipe at the 2015 CEL convention, because she saw it as a relevant and timely topic for teacher education students.

All in all: The transition to green publication has been great. Pamela Crews at NCTE is an incredible person to collaborate with, and she is always open to maximizing on the digital platform of ELQ. For the October 2017 issue, we plan to embed links to candidates’ speeches and the ballot to vote for Member at Large, etc.

Oona Marie Abrams, Editor
Language Arts (LA)

Language Arts (http://www.ncte.org/journals/la) is a professional journal for elementary and middle school teachers and teacher educators. It provides a forum for discussions on all aspects of language arts learning and teaching, primarily as they relate to children in pre-kindergarten through the eighth grade. Issues discuss both theory and classroom practice, highlight current research, and review children’s and young adolescent literature, as well as classroom and professional materials of interest to language arts educators. (Published September, November, January, March, May, and July)

Language Arts Editorial Team Report
Volume 94: September 2016 - July 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Theme</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Submitted MS</th>
<th>Rejected MS</th>
<th>Published MS</th>
<th>Invited MS</th>
<th>Percent Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoints and Visions</td>
<td>Sept. 2016</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Books: Windows, Mirrors, Doors, Maps, and More</td>
<td>Nov. 2016</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Tweens”: Too Old for This, Too Young for That!</td>
<td>Jan. 2017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoints and Visions</td>
<td>Mar. 2017</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma, Loss, and Literacies</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Decision Pending</td>
<td>Decision Pending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Decision Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Volume 94 Feature Articles, Perspectives on Practice, and Departments

Feature Articles
Feature Articles include original research studies of literacy and language, preschool-grade 8. Characterized by methodological and theoretical soundness, Feature Articles include portraits of the language arts across multiple contexts and modalities, provide clear implications for teaching and learning, and make a significant contribution to advancing knowledge in the field. We also consider submissions that are more conceptual in nature and that attend to broader issues, research trends, and policies shaping the field of language arts. (approximately 6,500 words)

Perspectives on Practice
These submissions speak directly to the diverse practitioners of the language arts, including teachers, librarians, literacy specialists, children’s book authors and illustrators, professional development providers, and more. Submissions may include a description of an innovative teaching strategy; an exploration of promising new apps, book series, or games that support literacy learning; insights related to creating children’s literature; professional learning opportunities that nurture inquiry and reflection; perspectives on current or controversial issues in the field of language arts; or additional topics determined by the author. These first-person contributions are chosen by the
editors and are engaging and accessible to the multiple audiences of Language Arts. (approximately 1000-1500 words)

Research & Policy
The goal of this Department is to offer insightful research and policy pieces related to the field of Language Arts. Articles will be invited and include the following: research synthesis, emerging or cutting edge theoretical frameworks or studies, past/present perspectives on seminal research, or reviews of critical areas of policy. A few scholars who have contributed to this department are Ebony Elizabeth Thomas and Elizabeth Dutro. Gerald Campano is the department editor. (approximately 5,000 words)

Invited Dialogue
Some issues will include interviews with a variety of individuals who can provide additional insights related to the themes for each issue. Guests include notable scholars and authors of children’s literature as well as publishing representatives such as editors and book designers. Individuals interviewed in volume 94 include Duncan Tonatiuh and Dr. Violet J. Harris, Tom Angleberger, Bryan Collier, and Rebecca M. Davis. Jennifer D. Turner is the department editor. (approximately 4,000 words)

Language Arts Lessons
This new feature brings a range of pedagogical and literary theories to the classroom in accessible and meaningful ways. We invite experts to offer a short, lively description of a pedagogical practice (e.g., writing workshop) or theoretical perspective and to provide questions and activities that teachers can use immediately in their classroom. For instance, a scholar or teacher may write a short piece about how to read comics and then demonstrate how to invite students to make meaning with visual texts; a feminist scholar may offer ideas about how to engage young people in analyzing the construction of gender in a picture book or novel. In each Language Arts Lessons column, we will also highlight 2-3 professional texts to extend and enrich the inquiries. Scholars who have been invited to write for this department include Rudine Sims Bishop, Detra Price-Dennis, Mariana Souto-Manning, Roberta Price Gardner, and Sylvia Vardell. Haeny Yoon is the department editor. (approximately 1500 words)

Children’s Literature Reviews
This department will continue to highlight recently published children’s literature for children. It will feature the Notable Children’s Books in the Language Arts (March issue) as well as the winners of the Charlotte Huck and Orbis Pictus Awards (November issue). Notable poetry books will be published in the July issue. Our department editor will work closely with the editorial team to ensure that the column aligns with themed issues. For example, the issue on Tweens will feature books written specifically for this age group while the issue on Trauma, Loss and Literacies will focus on books related to experiencing and overcoming trauma for children in grades Prek-8. Grace Enriquez is the department editor. (approximately 3,500 words)

Volume 95 Calls for Proposals

Advocacy for the Language Arts
September 2017 (due September 15, 2016)

For this issue we expand on the NCTE 2016 convention theme and invite manuscripts that explore how language arts educators engage in advocacy. We want to know to whom and for what do you advocate? We are interested in efforts that help educators deepen their commitments and remain hopeful within the literacy field. How do readers of Language Arts, for example, come together, take ethical positions, defend their profession, care for students, and create possibility in their work? Do you assume roles as teacher–leaders to effect change or participate in collaborative learning and inquiry networks to nourish and sustain your professional lives? How does leadership for language arts curricula and pedagogy occur within the confines of political, bureaucratic, or community expectations? Who stands up for learners susceptible to low literacy achievement such as those with disabilities, immigrant youth, African American boys, or children living in poverty? What types of classroom, school, district, university, nonprofit, or community based initiatives or pathways (big or small) provide support for advocates of improved literacy teaching and learning? These are the types of questions we are hoping to explore.
Viewpoints and Visions  
November 2017 (due November 15, 2016)

For this unthemed issue, we invite Feature Article and Perspectives on Practice submissions that offer a variety of viewpoints and visions related to language arts across multiple settings and modalities. What topics, concerns, or issues do you think are important to today’s readers of Language Arts? What kinds of theoretical lenses have you applied to your inquiry work to increase our collective understandings of language arts instruction? How does your research illustrate the range of ways in which young people are engaged with the language arts? What trends do you see in the field of language arts? What innovative literacy practices do you see in the diverse spaces of classrooms and community settings? Within a digital age, how are our understandings of children’s literature, writing instruction, and literacy learning shifting? These are just a few of the many questions that can be explored in this issue. Join us in crafting an assortment of articles that helps to expand our viewpoints and visions about language arts.

It’s Primary: Literacy Learning in the Early Years  
January 2018 (due January 15, 2017)

Educators often shoulder immense pressure from numerous forces in regard to supporting young children’s early literacy learning (preschool through grade 3). Parents, politicians, and other stakeholders recognize the importance of the early grades in laying a solid literacy foundation for later success in schooling and life. In this issue we invite articles that focus on innovative language arts practices taking place in early childhood settings in and out of school. Some of the many questions that can be explored in this issue are: How can out of school settings like museums, libraries, and community centers support language arts learning for young children? What types of children’s literature (e.g., wordless, alphabet, transitional chapter books, nonfiction) best support early literacy development? How are children being encouraged to explore the craft of picturebook authors and illustrators—such as Laura Vaccaro Seeger, Donald Crews, Wong Herbert Yee, and Yuyi Morales—whose work is aimed at young readers? How are technological advances and social media (e.g., iPads and Twitter) impacting and reshaping language arts instruction for young children? For instance, how might preschoolers or kindergarteners use iPads or various apps to read and compose? How are long held literacy practices such as reading aloud, shared reading, and word study (and even assessment of these practices) evolving in our digital age? How can families and educators collaborate to support young children’s growth in the language arts? Join us in putting together a collection of articles about young children and language arts learning that will push and challenge our thinking.

Reimagining Writers and Writing  
March 2018 (due March 15, 2017)

In this issue, we seek Feature Article and Perspectives on Practice submissions that provide vivid portraits of young people writing. How are young people chartering new territory and reaching new audiences as writers, multimodal composers, and bricoleurs, seeking inspiration from the world around them and drawing on all the tools, modes, and platforms at their disposal?  We also seek insights into the teaching of writing. What do we know about promising instructional strategies that promote critical, creative, argumentative, and analytical writing? Within this rapidly evolving landscape of digital writing, we also recognize seismic shifts in how we define, experience, and research writing.  How do new technologies, social media, and multimedia platforms shape how young people participate in writing events?  How are definitions of writing workshop, the writing process, and writing assessment shifting in response to these new practices and understandings?  Please join us in crafting an issue that expands our understandings and helps us reimagine writers and writing.

Changes in Children’s Literature  
May 2018 (due May 15, 2017)

In this issue, we invite Feature Article and Perspectives on Practice submissions that address the ways in which children’s literature is changing and how these changes are shaping young people’s reading of and responses to
literature. Some changes, such as the availability of e-books and picturebook apps, reflect the digital age in which we live. Other changes, like the rise of multigenre texts, reflect imaginative and playful takes on the very notion of “genre” itself. In light of these transformations, long-standing definitions and understandings of authorship, readers, genre, books, and meaning-making are in flux. How are these shifts in children’s literature transforming language arts instruction in today’s classrooms and in other settings? When introducing texts that are highly interactive, that feature multiple perspectives, and that contain indeterminate meanings, how are teachers engaging students in interpreting and analyzing these texts? What are some promising strategies for reading the visual elements and design features in boundary-pushing texts such as graphic novels, digital fiction, etc.? How are children using social media to read and respond to books or to communicate with children’s book authors and illustrators? In what ways have recent advancements in print and digital self-publishing inspired young writers and artists? Share your studies and stories in this themed issue.

Viewpoints and Visions
July 2018 (due July 15, 2017)

For this unthemed issue, we invite Feature Article and Perspectives on Practice submissions that offer a variety of viewpoints and visions related to language arts across multiple settings and modalities. What topics, concerns, or issues do you think are important to today’s readers of Language Arts? What kinds of theoretical lenses have you applied to your inquiry work to increase our collective understandings of language arts instruction? How does your research illustrate the range of ways in which young people are engaged with the language arts? What trends do you see in the field of language arts? What innovative literacy practices do you see in the diverse spaces of classrooms and community settings? Within a digital age, how are our understandings of children’s literature, writing instruction, and literacy learning shifting? These are just a few of the many questions that can be explored in this issue. Join us in crafting an assortment of articles that helps to expand our viewpoints and visions about language arts.

Wanda Brooks, Jonda C. McNair, Kelly Wissman, Co-Editors
**Research in the Teaching of English (RTE)**

*Research in the Teaching of English* (http://www.ncte.org/journals/rte) is the flagship research journal of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) in the United States. It is a broad-based, multidisciplinary journal composed of original research articles and short scholarly essays on a wide range of topics significant to those concerned with the teaching and learning of languages and literacies around the world, both in and beyond schools and universities. Published August, November, February, and May.

Currently housed at Michigan State University and Northeastern University, the editorial team includes co-editors Ellen Cushman and Mary M. Juzwik and assistant editors Scott Jarvie, who works as production editor; Mandie Dunn, who handles manuscript intake and reviewer assignments; and Heather Falconer, who handles special projects and daily journal tasks. Our team works closely with Kurt Austin and Rona Smith at NCTE.

**Submissions**

Submissions to *RTE* fall into one of two categories: (1) full-length articles or (2) Forum pieces. Full-length articles typically present empirical research (broadly defined) and analyze or interpret data generated by authors using sound and vigorous research methodologies. *RTE* also publishes various sorts of essays in the forum. Following an essayist genre, the forums are often solicited from leading scholars in the field. All forum essays, including solicited papers, undergo peer review.

The table below provides a summary of data on *RTE*’s internal operation between July 2, 2015-July 1, 2016. *RTE* has continued to receive a high number of submissions since we assumed the editorship in August, 2012: we received 196 submissions this calendar year (compare with 65 submissions reported by the previous editorial team, received from July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles &amp; Forums</th>
<th>Manuscripts received</th>
<th>In process</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Withdrawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-U.S.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-U.S.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increasing Impact of RTE**

We have worked to increase the impact factor of *RTE* in numerous ways. We are vigorously recruiting manuscripts at national and international conferences, including the annual meetings of NCTE, LRA, AERA, and CCCC; the biennial meeting of the International Association for the Improvement of Mother Tongue Education; and the triennial Writing Research Across Borders Conference, both in 2013. The following are some indicators of the impact the Journal is making:

- For fiscal year 2016 (July 2015 – June 2016), *RTE*’s circulation was 2,210. Of those, 1,636 were regular print subscriptions and 574 were Green, electronic-only subscriptions (see Table 1).
The total income for the journal for FY16 was $95,417 (compared to $101,900 for the previous fiscal year, and $99,701 for what NCTE budgeted to make in FY16), representing a decrease of ~6% from the previous year and ~4% less than was budgeted for this year.

*RTE* also made $1,090 in permissions fees, slightly exceeding the projected income of $1,000.

**Special Projects**

**Abstract Translations**

To support our vision of increasing the global presence of the journal, we have been piloting a translation project for article abstracts that began in the 49th volume year (August 2014) and has continued into the 50th. Translations in the past year were completed for the following languages: Arabic, French, German, Hindi, Korean, Mandarin, Russian and Spanish. It has been a challenge recruiting and retaining translators, and we are continuing to seek funding and incentives to interest colleagues in this work.

**Purves Award**

The Alan C. Purves Award is presented annually to the author(s) of the *Research in the Teaching of English* article from the previous year’s volume judged as likely to have the greatest impact on educational practice. As editors, we have established a timeline and procedure for the formation of the committee that selects the award recipient(s). A timeline for the award process follows:

- Editors appoint an Editorial Board member to form the committee (another Editorial Board member, a practicing teacher, and a graduate student/assistant professor in the field) and outlines the task (February-March, 2016)
- Committee reviews articles, deliberates, prepares recommendation (April-June, 2016)
- Committee sends recommendation to NCTE (June 15, 2016)
- Editors announce Purves Award winner at NCTE Conference (November, 2016)
- *RTE* publishes Purves Award announcement (issue 51.3, February, 2017)

This year’s awards committee was chaired by editorial board member Amanda Godley (University of Pittsburgh), and included Robert Jimenez (Vanderbilt University), Katrina Bartow Jacobs (University of Pittsburgh), and Jason Torres-Rangel (UCLA Community School).

This year’s winning article was “#WhoNeedsDiverseBooks?: Preservice Teachers and Religious Neutrality with Children’s Literature” by Denise Dávila (University of Nevada).

**Other Awards**

**Asao B. Inoue** received the 2016 CWPA’s Outstanding Scholarship Award for his 2014 *RTE* article “Theorizing Failure in US Writing Assessments.” The award recognizes an outstanding article published in a refereed journal besides *WPA: Writing Program Administration*.

**Ellen Cushman and Mary M. Juzwik, Co-Editors**
Talking Points (TP)

Talking Points (http://www.ncte.org/journals/tp) is published by WLU, the Whole Language Umbrella, a conference of NCTE. Talking Points helps promote literacy research and the use of whole language instruction in classrooms. It provides a forum for parents, classroom teachers, and researchers to reflect about literacy and learning. (Published semiannually, October and May.)

Talking Points journal published two issues beginning July 1, 2015 and ending June 30, 2016. The October 2015 issue was “Inquiring with Whole Language Practices,” and the May 2016 issue was “Whole Language in the 21st Century.” We are continuing with our non-themed issues since it has helped with increasing the number of manuscripts submitted without having to extend the deadlines.

We received ten submissions for October 2015 issue. One manuscript from May 2015 was moved to the October issue due to space issues. So, we published that manuscript and two additional ones, which made an acceptance rate of 20%. One of the three authors is a professor, one is a doctoral student, and one is a teacher leader. In addition, the Professional Resource section addressed democracy and critical literacy education. We received fourteen submissions for May 2016 issue. We published one article that was accepted earlier and could not be published yet because of space and two others. This resulted in an acceptance rate of 21%. One of the authors is a professor and one is a doctoral student. The last article is a joint collaboration between a professor and numerous doctoral students. One article was held to publish in the October 2016 issue. In total, we received 24 submissions from July 1, 2014 to May 1, 2015 and published 6 articles. Our average acceptance rate this year is 21%.

The “Professional Resource Section” section continues to be authored by Kathryn Mitchell Pierce and the Talking Points Professional Book Club. It includes reviews of whole language resources and tools and related mini-articles. For example, the May 2016 issue included whole language web-based resources from Rick Meyer. The May 2016 issue will be the last with the Professional Resource Section. Beginning in the October 2016 issue (which begins our new terms as editors), there will be changes made to this format to allow for some new ways of thinking and showcasing teachers’ whole language practices.

We are fortunate to have many professional people volunteering to serve. We had 22 reviewers for October 2015 issue, while 23 reviewers served for May 2016 issue. Altogether, 45 reviewers committed to our journal this year. They are professors, teachers, and graduate students. We asked both a professor and a graduate student/teacher to review each submission.

We supplied detailed feedback to the rejected submissions and also sent reviewers’ comments and suggestions to the authors (without reviewers’ identified information). We advised our submitters about other places for submission if they were rejected.

We have set the call for the October 2016 issue: Critical Issues in Whole Language. Each of the editors has been supported by graduate assistants, Amanda Wand, Megan Anderson, and Megan Economos (summer 2016) who assisted with the editorial process as well as the continued support of Rona Smith at NCTE. We are beginning a transition to upgrade to the online submission system called Editorial Manager. We believe an online submission format will streamline the editing process.

Sally Brown and Deborah MacPhee, Editors
Teaching English in the Two-Year College (TETYC)

Teaching English in the Two-Year College (http://www.ncte.org/journals/TETYC), the journal of the Two-Year College English Association (TYCA), is for instructors of English in two-year colleges as well as for teachers of first- and second-year composition in four-year institutions. TETYC publishes theoretical and practical articles on composition, developmental studies, technical and business communication, literature, creative expression, language, and the profession. Published September, December, March, and May.

Transition to the Editorial Manager review system:
● In the first year of my work, I was able to facilitate successful transition to the use of Editorial Manager for all the parts of the review process. Using the spreadsheet from former editor Jeff Sommers, my editorial assistant input all the reviewer contact information. I invited reviewers to update their profiles. Since December, Editorial Manager has been up and running. Most submitters, authors, and reviewers have responded positively to the new system. There are still some issues that have come up including reviewers who have had trouble noting their numerical rankings of submission or authors who have had to figure out how to submit revisions or additional supporting files. We are working out those bugs as they happen.

Creation of TETYC Editor’s Blog:
● Launched the TETYC editor blog which has been a good tool to advertise special issue topics, and post announcements.

Expanded Reviewer Pool:
● I circulated an invitation to WPA and on Facebook sites/groups relevant to TETYC for new reviewers. The review process, in my experience, is not always very transparent, and I think it's good to loop new folks into the professional activity that is scholarly publishing in ways that demystify the process a little. I added about a dozen reviewers via this method. A second approach I have undertaken is when I have received a manuscript on a topic where I have a somewhat 'shallower' pool of reviewers to draw from, I've approached scholars whose work is used in the article and specifically invited them to review. Everyone I've invited in this fashion has agreed to review which provides a great source of expert feedback for authors and brings new people into the process.

Advertised for and appointed a new set of book review co-editors.
● The two review co-editors, Mark Blaauw-Hara (North Central Michigan College) and Sheri Rysdam (Utah Valley State University) have been valuable additions to the editorial team. They have ushered in some reviews taken over from outgoing editor Annie del Principe and have received and processed (through Editorial Manager) some new review submissions. They've also been great about pursuing and advertising books that the journal would like to review—soliciting reviewers and managing the peer review process.

Developed New Resources for Reviewers and Authors:
● To support reviewers as they work to develop an understanding of the genre of the manuscript review, I developed some guidelines that include generative questions for reviewers as they evaluate manuscripts. It is available at the TETYC webpage.
● Posted Instructional Note Guidelines and Book Review Guidelines: Drawing from documents already available from Jeff Sommers and outgoing book review editor Annie del Principe, I put together guidelines for Instructional Notes and for book reviews; these I have posted to the editor’s blog.

Completed the first cycle of producing a journal issue:
● My first issue—September 2016—is out and available online. The transition process put us a little behind the usual availability but I'm hoping that with each issue, the process will become more intuitive.
● The December issue is ready to launch into the production process. The Table of Contents is as follows:
Editor's Intro

2017: Preparing TYC Faculty
TYCA White Paper on Placement Reform
Self-Regulated Strategy Instruction and the Basic Writer: The Critical Connection between Self-Mastery and Learning to Write
Writing about Language: Studying Language Diversity with First-Year Writers
Academic Writing As Journey
Source Building: Creating Opportunities for Students to Use Classmates as Resources
Sophists or SMEs?: Teaching Rhetoric Across the Curriculum in the Technical Writing Classroom
Did You Hear That?: Using Sound to Minimize Distance in Online Writing Courses
Naming What We Know (Panchula)
Review of First-year Composition

Editor essay
Reprint Special Issue calls
TYCA Research Committee
Prof/Org. Report
Blake, et al.
Looker
Bartley, Aryn
Dippre
Beemer
Review Essay/Borgman (Online Writing)
Book review
Sailor

TYCA Research Committee
Prof/Org. Report
Feature
Feature
WW4M
WW4M
Instructional Note
Review Essay
Book Review
Book Review

Other Activities as TYYC Editor

- I responded to the call from Howard Tinberg to serve on the CCCC Research Initiative Grant Review Committee. In addition to advocating for funding for proposals from under-funded institutions, I helped draft a request to the EC officers to shift the focus for grant proposal evaluation to offer formative feedback as well as summative, to invest more dollars into supporting researchers from a wide range of backgrounds, and to build in a professional mentoring component that will support those who wish to contribute to the professional/disciplinary conversations in the field but who have lacked access to training, support, review, mentoring, or other professional resources that are unevenly allocated in the field.

- In my role as a non-voting member of the CCCC EC in addition to the TYCA EC, I have participated in some subcommittee work including developing an amendment to the bylaws of CCCC and working with TYCA chair Jeff Andelora and two other EC members to create a CCCC "user's guide."

- Agreed to serve as the "Labor Liaison" position called for by a vote at the CCCC Business Meeting in Houston.

Journal Accountability Report:

Below I include the accountability report that Editorial Manager generates, showing the numbers of manuscripts submitted, reviewers engaged, reviews received, and editorial decisions made.

(continued)
### Submission Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Manuscripts Received (by First Receipt Date)</strong></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bona Fide</em> manuscripts submitted by Authors during the specified time period. This number may include submissions that have been removed by the journal office and manuscripts that have been submitted, but have not yet been assigned to an Editor.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Manuscripts Received (by current Initial Date Submitted)</strong></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts submitted by Authors during the specified time period. This number may change if a submission is returned to the Author and resubmitted by the Author at a later date. In this case, the resubmission date is stored as the Initial Date Submitted, overwriting the original Initial Date Submitted. This number may include submissions that have been removed by the journal office and manuscripts that have been submitted, but have not yet been assigned to an Editor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submissions Removed by the Journal Office</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial staff may remove submissions from the system before an Editor is assigned. Manuscripts included in this category are also included in New Manuscripts Received above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submissions Transferred</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts that were transferred to another publication before an Editor was invited or assigned. Manuscripts included in this category are also included in New Manuscripts Received above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscripts Submitted but not yet Assigned to an Editor</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a manuscript is submitted, the Editor can edit the submission and send it back to the Author for approval. This category includes any submissions being worked on, before any Editors have been assigned. Manuscripts included in this category are also included in New Manuscripts Received above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manuscripts Returned to the Author and Removed by the Author

Once a manuscript is submitted, the Editor can edit the submission and send it back to the Author. The Author can edit the submission, or approve the submission, or remove the submission. This category includes any submissions that the Author has removed (deleted), which means they cannot be resubmitted. Manuscripts included in this category are also included in New Manuscripts Received above.

Revisions Requested

Journal rendered a Revise decision during the specified time period.

Revised Manuscripts Received

Author submitted a revision during the specified time period. This figure is independent of the date the original manuscript was submitted, or when the revision was requested.

Total Revisions Received

This section includes revisions that were received by the journal office during the specified time period. This is not a subset of Revisions Requested in the Submission Statistics. The revision may have been requested at any time, but the counts below reflect revised submissions by the Author during the time period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rev 1</th>
<th>Rev 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revisions Submitted by Author</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions Declined by Author</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Turnaround Time for Author (days)</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Turnaround Time
This section includes submissions received by the journal office during the specified time period. The statistics are an indication of how long key activities are taking in the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission to Editor Assignment</th>
<th>0.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average number of days between the date the manuscript was received and the first Editor was assigned.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission to Reviewer Invitation</th>
<th>1.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average number of days between the date the manuscript was received and the first Reviewer was invited.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission to First Decision</th>
<th>43.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average number of days between the date the manuscript was received and the first decision.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reviewer Invitation Statistics

This section provides the breakdown of Total Reviewers Invited to Review during the time period, and the status of each invitation as of the report date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Reviewers Invited</th>
<th>405</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of Reviewers invited during the specified time period. Includes Reviewers who may have been subsequently terminated or un-invited.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreed to Review</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Reviewers invited during the time period who agreed to review and are still working on their reviews.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewers who Completed Reviews</th>
<th>218</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Reviewers who completed their reviews.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of Reviewers invited during the time period who agreed to review and have completed their review.

- **Declined to Review**: 44
- **Have not Responded to Review Invitation**: 3
- **Uninvited Reviewers**: 118
- **Terminated Reviewers**: 2

### Reviewer Performance Averages

This section includes some key statistics about the peer review process. Unless otherwise specified, all calculations are based on reviews completed during the time period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days to Respond to Invitation</th>
<th>1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of days between date Reviewer was invited and date Reviewer agreed or declined to review. Note the Reviewer may have been invited at any time; this calculation includes reviews that were agreed to or declined during the specified time period.</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days to Complete Review (from Date Invited)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days to Complete Review (from Date Agreed to Review)</td>
<td>Average days between date Reviewer agreed to the review invitation and the date the review was completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reviews per Reviewer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Late Reviews</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Days Late</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Early Reviews</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Days Early</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviewer Recommendation Summary**

This section shows the total number of Recommendation Terms submitted during the specified time period. The column of percentages is simply an indicator of the frequency with which each Term is used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer Recommendation Term</th>
<th>Reviews Completed</th>
<th>Frequency of Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept Conditionally</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to Publish</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reviews Completed</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Decision Summary

A separate table is displayed for each Revision Number. Total Decisions is the number of decisions made by the Editor with final decision-making authority for each submission during the specified time period. The Average Time to Decision is the number of days between the date the manuscript was received by the journal office, and the date the final decision was made. For a Revision, the Average Time to Decision is the average number of days between the date the Revision was submitted to the journal office and the date the final decision was made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accepted On Submission</th>
<th>Total Submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Submission By Editor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Submission to Publication</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Original Submission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor Decision Term</th>
<th>Total Decisions</th>
<th>Frequency of Decision</th>
<th>Average Time to Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept Conditionally</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Accept</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject MS without Field Review</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Editor Decisions | 73 | 100% | 43.5

**Revision 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor Decision Term</th>
<th>Total Decisions</th>
<th>Frequency of Decision</th>
<th>Average Time to Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept Conditionally</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Accept</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Editor Decisions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revision 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor Decision Term</th>
<th>Total Decisions</th>
<th>Frequency of Decision</th>
<th>Average Time to Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Accept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Editor Decisions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holly Hassel, Editor
Voices from the Middle (VM)

Voices from the Middle (http://www.ncte.org/journals/vm) offers articles on research and best practices in middle level reading, writing, speaking, and listening in the visual and language arts. Our mission is to be the cornerstone for the ongoing professional development of language arts educators. The journal is published four times each year (September, December, March, and May) and each issue is themed.

Editorial Transition
With the publication of the May 2016 issues of Voices from the Middle, our editorial team transitioned from Doug Fisher, Nancy Frey, and Diane Lapp to Sara Kajder and Shelbie Witte. Where Drs. Kajder and Witte began pre-planning in August of 2015, their work on the issues under their leadership actively began in December 2015 and has increased (as expected) throughout the fiscal year.

September 2016 Issue
The first issue under the direction of the new co-editors was published in September 2016 (24.1), under the theme “Raising our Teacher Voices.” This issue presented a major interior and cover redesign as well as elements including but not limited to columns by Chris Lehman and Linda Rief and centerpiece articles written by lead thinkers in our field (entitled “Leading the Call”) and current YA Lit and Middle Grades authors.

Upcoming Issues
To date, content has been set for all of Volume 24 with announced dates and calls for Volume 25. The September 2017 issue (25.1) will focus on celebrating the 25th anniversary of Voices from the Middle with invited content, the launch of two new columns (one on research for teachers and another from our friends in the Nerdy Book Club), and a return to several articles from VFM which teachers and other editors have identified as seminal to our field.

Middle Section Collaboration and Convention Planning
Voices from the Middle editors have worked in close collaboration with the leadership of the MLSSC and plan to share content both at each of the major middle section events and through our own session which will run as an interactive writing workshop for teachers looking to write about their practice.

Social Media Strategy
The editors have collaborated with NCTE staff throughout the fiscal year to develop an intentionally crafted social media presence within Facebook and Twitter, with plans for additional purposeful evolution into other spaces in an attempt to connect in real time with readers. We have also launched a bi-weekly podcast which is currently themed as a multi-segmented radio show. Member and reader uptake of the social media sites has been a significant part of the roll out of the changes which marked issue 24.1 and continue to help us build readership and buzz.

Sara Kajder and Shelbie Witte, Co-Editors