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# Process Summary

During 2018-2019, Total number of paper submissions decreased. The length of time to complete the review process increased from last year (Table 1).

Table 1:

*Submissions, Number of Reviewers and Days to Complete Review Process by Conference*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Conference** | **# of Submissions** | | | **# Reviewers** | | **Days to Complete** | | |
| 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | % Change | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | % Change |
| North Central | 36 | 34 | -5.5% | 51 | 45 | 44 | 56 | 27% |
| Southern | 58 | 44 | -24% | 81 | 74 | 61 | 62 | 1.6% |
| Western | 51 | 43 | -15.7% | 4 | 5 | 23 | 24 | 4.3% |
| National | 96 | 96 | 0% | 157 | 145 | 72 | 62 | - 13.9% |

NOTE: *Days to Complete* is the time from when submissions closed until the day accept/reject emails were sent.

* This past year, the number of people who rejected an invitation to review a manuscript or did not complete an invitation to review in a timely manner decreased (n = 46) across the three conferences (Western review panel) compared to (52 in 2017-18). Several individuals rejected all invitations to review. We still have many reviewers who submit to regional and national conferences, but decline all review requests.

# Other Items to Report

1. Reviews posted to the incorrect submission, missing review section scores and late submissions were found with all four conferences. Each requires additional attention and time to resolve. There is no set protocol for dealing with these issues. It is at the discretion of the review and submission manger and the research conference chair.
2. Andrew Thoron has been selected as the AAAE conference review and submission manager for 2019-2022. He has been trained and is ready to go!

# Concerns & Possible Changes to Protocol Guidelines

1. AAAE member commitment to completing a quality review in a timely manner is still questionable at best.
   1. The assumption of reviewer fatigue that has been raised in recent years. Are there potential solutions or is there another model we should explore moving forward?
   2. While the frequency of no to little comments/feedback to the author declined this past year, we continue to have papers with no comments (numbers only).
2. We continue to have members who do not accept invitations to review. Some for more than two years.
   1. The Review Process Manager has and will continue to adjust member profiles to remove the willing to review indicator from those profiles of member who have demonstrated a lack of willingness to help the profession in this review process. (Very time consuming) Several faculty members requested that they be removed from the system this past year.
3. The AAAE protocol guidelines for conference paper selection, presentations and awards was last amended in May 2010. Perhaps it is time to revisit these guidelines.
4. We have a relatively new research agenda. The review form was updated in summer 2016 to reflect this, however, a small percentage of the profession has updated their profile, which gives the review process manager little data to work with when assigning reviews.
5. A large number of papers submitted in our profession are designated as qualitative or mixed methods by the authors during submission. Few reviewers match that methodology in their profile. Nearly impossible to match with quality reviewers.
6. It is increasingly difficult to complete the review process for North Central region due to reviews being requested during the latter part of summer when most faculty are not on duty. This should be considered by the region to alleviate pressure on the conference review and submission manger.
7. There were fewer technical issues with FastTrack during the last year. The challenges posed by university filters and firewalls seemed minimal this past year.