

American Association for Agricultural Education
National Research Committee – Final Report
May 5, 2022

Committee members present: Stacy Vincent (Chair; Southern), Dustin Perry (Chair-elect; Western), Daniel Foster (North Central), Laura Hasselquist (North Central), Aaron Giorgi (North Central), Keith Frost (southern), JC Bunch (Southern), Chris Eck (Southern), Shelli Rampold (Southern), Trent Wells (Southern), Courtney Gibson (Western) Kasee Smith (Western), Michelle Burrows (Western)

Items of business

Election of Chair-Elect – Dr. Stacy Vincent (Kentucky)

- All committee members who were at the associate and full rank were automatically nominated. Many removed their names leaving three individuals to remain nominated: Joey Blackburn (LSU), JC Bunch (Florida), and Tyson Sorenson (Utah State)
- Dr. Tyson Sorenson (Utah State) was elected to chair-elect
- Dustin Perry (Montana State) will become chair

Research Conference Chair – Dr. Ryan Anderson (Texas State University)

- Overall, 96 papers were submitted to the national research conference and 72 were accepted
- All discussants received their assigned manuscripts last week
- Schedule was sent to Marilyn to be printed
- Thanks to everyone who volunteered to assist or recruit facilitators for each room.
- Special thanks was given to Dr. Anderson for the work he had put-forth on the facilitation of the research papers

Research Conference Chair Search – Dr. Chris Eck (Clemson)

- The committee (Dr. Dustin Perry, Dr. Chris Eck, and Dr. Rob Terry) met and created a list of potential chairs and determined that a joint chair approach would be implemented this year.
- Dr. JC Bunch and Dr. Brian Myers (Florida) agreed to serve as joint chair of the 2023 research committee
- **ACTION ITEM:** It was moved by Dr. Daniel Foster (Penn State) and second by Casee Smith (Idaho) that “AAAE pay the registration fee for the conference chair on an annual basis (emphasis on one registration fee).” Motion passed with no objections and will be forward to the business session.

Journal of Agricultural Education – Dr. Don Edgar (New Mexico State)

- The editing-managing board is working on approaches to improve the integrity of the Journal as they look at reviewer times and journal metrics.
- Dr. Christopher Clemons (Auburn) is providing a webinar on journal metrics and the committee was encouraged to attend the meeting on May 12th

- Light discussion occurred regarding the concept of a “special edition” or “invited papers”. The editing-managing board was going to discuss this more.

National Research Agenda – Dr. John Rayfield (Texas Tech)

- The committee had not met since the last research committee meeting as they will be meeting face-to-face in Oklahoma City where a report will be provided during the business meeting

Conference Submission Manager Report – Dr. Andrew Thoron (Abraham Baldwin Ag College)

- Dr. Thoron was unable to attend due to senior exit interviews on campus
- Dr. Vincent provided a copy of Dr. Thoron’s report to the committee and highlighted a few points in the report: a) total number of reviewers obtained this year; b) average days to complete reviews; and c) the number of people who rejected an invitation to review a manuscript or did not complete an invitation to review in a timely manner was 48
- Dr. Vincent added additional comments regarding the review of reviewer comments such as:
 - o The anchor of “Strongly Agree” was used the most ($f = 348$; 32%) with “Strongly Disagree” was used the least ($f = 29$). This is also reflective of the 2021 data with no significant change.
 - o The startling review as of the 29 “Strongly Disagree” used, nearly 25% were on manuscripts where the other two reviewers had given the manuscript an “agree” and/or “strongly agree”.
 - o The current review process weighs the manuscripts with a .33 for the manuscript reviews and a .67 for the average of the anchor provided by the three reviewers
 - As a result, some discrepancies were noted, such as: the 5th placed paper had a manuscript review z-score of 1.148 while the 17th paper had a review z-score of 1.187. Because the 5th placed paper had a “strongly agree” review and the 17th paper had a “slightly agree” review, a rank difference existed.

Agenda Items not addressed this meeting

- President Retallick and VP Lawver are working out the details regarding the board's directive regarding the strategic plan. The board charged them to request data from the strategic planning committees and standing committees as part of the process of updating strategic plan (see the benchmarks in the plan). As we prepare a plan, he asks that the research committee give some thought about data collection and related reporting. Due to time restrictions, this was not discussed.
 - o The committee discussed (briefly) the supply/demand study for teacher education. Can this be expanded?
- The committee voted at the January meeting to refer the discussion on the AAEE Scope of Research statement to the National Research Agenda Committee. Considering the NRA had not met, this was postponed.

Recommendations from the chair – Dr. Stacy Vincent (Kentucky)

- After listening to discussion over the past year, the following questions/statements were recommended for the committee to entertain in future meetings. Some of the items would entail a constitutional amendment if the committee thought it should be considered. These are recommendations for scholarly discussion rather action items that must be voted upon. Awareness has a way of squashing ignorance.
 - Should the chair of the research committee serve a two-year term? Reasoning – Each conference the committee has changes with the national conference serving as the change to the chair. It is difficult to obtain continuity but a two-year term could assist.
 - Should our overall anchor reviews reflect a bell curve (slightly disagree and slightly agree being the most frequent) or polar (strongly disagree least to strongly agree most)? Not sure if there is a correct answer but would be interesting to compare with other conferences
 - Reiterate in each region the need for research committee members who are at the rank of associate and full. The chair and chair-elect are to be at the rank of full (passage at the 2021 conference under chair, Dr. Kasee Smith). Associates and Full faculty have an established research agenda and can assist in moving the organization to establish its own agenda and assist young faculty and graduate students with innovative organizational practices.
 - Should the committee consider defining the anchors on the review process? Within the meeting the committee defined the anchors differently based upon how they score manuscripts. Could a simple definition assist reviewers that further aid the question of “Why do we conference?”
 - Should anchors be removed and a simple Yes/No question be asked? Does a question such as “Do you believe this paper could create scholarly dialogue among attendees? Yes/No?”
 - Should the weight of the anchors and manuscript reviews be changed? It is noted that the profession, overall, reflected anchor z-scores that reflected the manuscript review z-scores. Could be a mood point but a discussion to be have anyways.

Respectfully submitted,

Stacy K. Vincent, Chair
AAAE Research Committee
University of Kentucky