



Conference on
College Composition
& Communication

Academic Publishing: Three Editors on What You Need to Know

Thursday, October 24 | 12:00 p.m. ET

A live webinar discussion with three editors who will provide valuable information regarding academic publishing. An audience-driven Q&A will follow.



Malea Powell (CCC)



Steve Parks (SWR)



Holly Hassel (TETYC)



Sweta Baniya (PU)

Academic Publishing: Three Editors on What You Need to Know Webinar Thursday, October 24, 2019, 12:00–1:00 p.m. ET

Well, hello everyone, welcome to the first webinar of hopefully many. My name is Asao Inoue, I am the chair of CCCC's, and I'm just going to offer a really quick introduction to our facilitator, and I'll let her introduce and tell you all what we're going to do and how it's going to proceed. And then I want to just give a couple of thanks to some folks who helped the long road to get this started, the webinar series. So our facilitator today for this first webinar is Sweta Baniya. Sweta Baniya is from Nepal and currently a doctoral candidate at Purdue University. She is working on her dissertation project that studies emergence of transnational assemblages during the Nepal earthquake and Puerto Rico's hurricane. Her dissertation project focuses on merging comparative rhetorics as well as technical professional communication by studying disaster-affected communities and comparing their emergent digital composition, communication, and rhetorical practices. Her scholarship is informed by non-Western rhetorical traditions and practices that she acquired through her community in Nepal. Currently she is the editorial fellow of CCCC's Studies in Writing & Rhetoric [series], and she's also one of the founding members of nextGEN, the first international graduate student listserv. I also want to thank just a couple of people real quickly who helped organize and put together this webinar and set up some structures hopefully that will allow us to continue to do it on a quarterly basis for members of CCCC. And that is the chair of the EC Subcommittee on Special Projects which put this together, Christine Tulley and her colleagues and members of that subcommittee, Trixie Smith, Eli Goldblatt, Christina Cedillo, Jennifer Sano-Franchini, Suzanne Labadie, and Carolyn Calhoun-Dillahunt, who's the officer liaison to it. So I will now, without any further ado, give the floor to our illustrious facilitator, Sweta.

Hello everyone, thank you, Dr. Inoue. Thank you for joining us today in this CCCC's webinar, "Academic Publishing, What You Need to Know." My name is Sweta Baniya and I'll be today's moderator for this webinar. Our goal for today is to provide viewers with valuable information regarding academic publishing. Towards this goal we have Dr. Malea Powell, editor of *College Composition and Communication*, Dr. Steve Parks, editor of Studies in Writing and Rhetoric [series], and Dr. Holly Hassel,

editor of *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*; she will be joining us a little late. Thank you, Dr. Powell, Dr. Parks, and Dr. Hassel for joining us today to share ideas about navigating the publishing process and maybe busting some kind of myths regarding publishing. Each speaker will speak for ten minutes, and we'll open the floor for a Q&A. For the Q&A session, what I would like is to encourage our viewers to write down questions along with your name on the chat feature of Zoom, and I'll take up the questions on your behalf. Now, without delay, let's begin our talk with Dr. Powell, editor of *College Composition and Communication* [CCC].

Hi, thank you, Sweta, thank you, Asao. I'm nervous to be the first editor to speak, but I hope that I can give you some ideas of what will happen as I move into full-time editorship of CCC. I think that the submission guidelines are somewhere on the PowerPoint that you'll see, and one of the things I want to really emphasize here is that as I move in, we're going to shift the submission guidelines a little bit to more fully encompass the mission of the CCCs and its wide diversity. So whereas we've always talked about CCCs as accepting composition studies and study scholarship and work that focuses on teaching in a composition classroom, that won't change, but we're also going to broaden it to folks who do writing studies in a more varied way, who bring rhetoric into the classroom, who do literacy studies. I'm particularly interested in scholarship that explores issues of agency power and the potential of diverse learners in and out of college classrooms. I want to see submissions that produce new knowledge about diverse language, literacy, communication styles, writing practices, rhetorical strategies, teaching strategies, and assessment practices in not just our first-year writing classrooms, but in all of our writing communication and rhetoric classrooms. I think that the mission of CCCs encompasses that broad diversity, and for me, the success of CCC depends not so much on how much we reject, but how broadly and widely we represent the true diversity of our discipline. So send me your stuff. That's what I'll say. And I think that there are some myths about what you should do before you submit to CCC. My editorial assistant, Tania de Sostoa-McCue, probably answers twenty or thirty emails a week asking us, are you interested in this kind of thing, are you interested in that kind of thing? And the truth is, you don't necessarily have to email us, unless you think you're really trying to send something that is way outside of what CCCs has ever published before. Go ahead and submit, and we'll put you through that process where Tania looks at it, I look at it, we solicit reviewers, we send it out for review. Give yourself the opportunity to get that full moment of immersion in the peer review process. I would ask that you have mentors or colleagues look at your submission before you send it, just because that can help you do the kind of review that we might ask for immediately, just to make sure that you're focused and clear and speaking directly to the broad diversity of the CCC's audience. There are a number of different kinds of submissions that we currently take. Of course, we take articles, in many kinds of genres. I know that there's a myth about CCCs only accepting particular kinds of very traditional scholarly genres, but if you look back at the history of CCC, right, this is a place where people have published in all kinds of genres, and so I want to really encourage folks to think about genre and format in relation to the argument they're trying to make and the audience they're trying to reach, right? CCC is for everyone in the discipline, and so the way that you might address someone in your very specific field will be different than the way you want to address the CCC audience. But that doesn't mean you have to, like, narrow or dumb down or hide the kind of scholarship you're doing; it just means you need to think about what you're saying in relation to the broadest audience possible. So we do have articles, of course. Interchanges: you probably have seen these before if you've ever looked at the journal in print. If you

read something in *CCC* and you have something to say about it, send me your comments. You send them directly to us at our editorial team Gmail, and we talk to you about those comments. We want to make sure that they're respectful, but also that they represent a set of concerns that other readers might have. And then we set up an exchange between you and the original author of the piece to have a conversation about their piece. And so I want to encourage people to get involved in the Interchanges and to think about *CCC* as a place to have a conversation, instead of just a place to, you know, a place you go online to get an article or just, you read it every month or you skim it every month just to see what's going on. We'd like to move Interchanges to a website at some point, but we'll have to revise our website before that happens. The other kinds of things: we are actively accepting book reviews right now, and we'll soon start to solicit book reviews. And these I think of as short, direct reviews of things that are coming out right now, and so if you're doing book reviews, if you're reading something that you think you could write 500 to 1,000 words about, again, contact me. Because I also want the journal to become a repository, an archival space, where if I'm looking for something in a field I'm not familiar with, I can go look at book reviews that *CCC* has published. Again, this is something else that we're probably going to move into an online space at some point. Book review essays; if you've read *CCC* before, you know that these show up periodically; someone takes three to five books, has a sort of topic focus, a specific focus they want to discuss through them. If you have ideas for book review essays, again, contact me. The other thing that I think that my predecessor, Jonathan Alexander, did really well was set up symposia sections, collections of short pieces on a sort of of-the-moment topic. And we are going to start arranging some of those, but we'd also like to see some of those ideas submitted from the readership broadly. And the final thing is special issue topics. We are going to go back to special issues if we get good pitches for the focus of those special issues. Those need to come a little further out, and they're a little more complicated. But we really want to represent, like I keep saying, the broad diversity of *CCCC's* members and *CCC's* readers, and I think that the way to do that is to get members and readers involved in telling me what they want to see in the journal, and doing so through a number of mechanisms. So I'm gonna just glide through the process really briefly, talk a little bit about what the categories mean when you get a response from me. And then I'll probably be done by then, right, Sweta? So when you submit to *CCC*, you do it through Editorial Manager, and my editorial assistant finds some reviewers for you and that can take a little while. We find reviewers, we send your piece out, we generally give reviewers about six weeks. Some of you out there are probably, have probably been reviewers. Some of you know reviewers. Review is a place where the process of submission can slow down. But we do try to get reviews back in a timely fashion. When we get the reviews back, we process them inhouse. I either look at them right away or, if the reviews are widely divergent, we send out for a sort of tiebreaker. Sometimes when I'm looking at a piece and it's not, I'm not familiar with the field and someone says accept and someone says reject, I want someone else who's really familiar with the field to understand, and can understand what's going on in the piece, to give me advice about what we should do. Then we make decisions; we send you a note. I think that when folks get a rejection from *CCC*, they feel bad. And there are two reasons why we reject pieces. One is that it's just not a good fit for the scope of the journal. And sometimes I can't see that. I can't just do a desk rejection of a piece. If it's outside of my field or if I think it might be able to fit, I want reviewers in the community to help me set those boundaries all the time. I don't want to be the only one setting those boundaries. The other reason you might get a Reject is that something's just not developed enough to be publishable with revision in a reasonable amount of time. That's why I say if you're thinking of sending something in, have some mentors and colleagues take a look at it and sort of pull it up a little bit to a place, to a place

that's more—it's more organized, more clear, more focused. Revise and Resubmit is probably what we give most of the pieces that we see. And for a Revise and Resubmit, that means this might be publishable with revision. There might be a problem with audience alignment we want you to fix, there might be some writerly revisions, there might be some—some reviewers might have some concerns about your citational practices. And so R&R is pretty much what we give to, I would say, 60 percent of the pieces that I see. And an R&R is not a Reject; an R&R is, could you revise this? 'Cause I think there's something here. And I think that graduate students especially see an R&R as a rejection. As a very experienced faculty member, I see an R&R as "Not quite there yet; keep going." Accept, we have Accept Conditionally. Again, that's an acceptance. We're going to place it in an issue; we have some things we want you to do with it. We have a straight Acceptance that I've only ever seen once, with a piece that was in such good shape it didn't even need editorial work. And I have a new category that I've been using called Accept with Substantial Revision, which is kind of between a Revise and Resubmit and an Accept Conditionally. And for me that's a category that I'm trying to use to create a more equitable editorial process for folks who may not have had access to the kind of mentoring around writing that we would all prefer, or that is such a good idea that I want to make sure that the writer invests in it and keeps going with it. And like I said, those are our categories, those are sort of what some things mean. I'm happy to answer questions later. As most of you know, the publishing schedule of CCC is very far. We hand our manuscript to NCTE six months before the publication comes out. And so that tells you how far away we are. We're booking right now for June and September of 2020. So if you send something to CCC, know it won't be quick, but the kind of attention and opportunity you'll get will be very thorough and very supportive. That's all.

Thank you so much, Dr. Powell. Now, without delay, we'll move to Dr. Parks.

Just unmuting first. Thanks to all of you for listening; very kind of you to take some time out of your afternoon. And I want to thank all the folks who put labor into making this happen, as well as CCC for letting me edit *Studies in Writing and Rhetoric* [the series]. And I want to say, the first thing you'll notice is that my slide is not nearly as great as all the slides that came before or after, so that's a little awkward for me. So I want to talk about *Studies in Writing and Rhetoric*, but I also want to sort of toggle back and forth between the process of *Studies in Writing and Rhetoric* and just generally how to think about book projects and writing in the field. So *SWR*, *Studies in Writing and Rhetoric*, I've heard is the oldest series in the field focused on writing and rhetoric. I don't know if that's true. But I think what that story says is that it's a series that has helped shape knowledge in the field, and one of its key responsibilities is to make sure it represents the whole field. So it would not be good for *SWR* to endlessly publish on one area, or to endlessly publish the same type of scholar. And I think of *SWR* as sort of being a constellation of texts. And when you're thinking about whether your piece fits into *SWR* or not, you can look at the constellation, notice what have been some primary themes, and then where have those themes failed to carry forth or represent or discuss the whole field. So when I became editor, I followed Victor Villanueva, which was intimidating, but one of the things I was thinking is that—and Victor had started to change this—that many of the people who'd published in the field were white scholars. Many of the students discussed were Research 1 students. Many of the histories were about sort of composition as a white-centered field or communities that were sort of not as diverse as the students or the nation we

live in. So, when I looked at that constellation, then I thought, okay, my work as editor is to sort of draw the series into broader parts of the field. So I began to think about what it would mean for someone in a tribal college or Hispanic-serving institution to write for the field. What would it mean to take into account comp as an international field? What would it mean to support histories that talk, say, about the caucuses or other elements of activists and teachers in the field? And so, when I get proposals, I am intrigued by proposals that will look at the constellation as it exists, reads the mission statement in its all-encompassing sort of effort to speak to that field, and explains to me the gaps in the field or in my own vision. So that's sort of how, and in general, I think that's how you should approach series. You look at the mission statement and look at what they're producing. That tells you one thing, whether there's a voice for you in that series, but also it lets you think about how your work can expand the field. I find most editors want books that they've never thought of or they couldn't do, that can make their series live up to its promise. So that would be the first way I would think about publishing in the field.

Following that, I would say that when I thought about what it means to represent the whole field in an academic series, I had to think about labor conditions, right? I had to think about, like, that if you're teaching five fives, a single-author monograph isn't going to be possible for you. And there are more people who teach in high teaching positions than there are who teach in limited teaching positions. So I've tried to think about maybe using more anthologies. So the collectives of individuals, say, from the community college sort of teaching world, would have a chance to be in the series. I've tried to think about how if we're going to sort of fully represent the diversity of knowledges in the field, that might mean publishing scholarship that emerges in different formats, for lack of a better word, say, from Indigenous communities. Where scholarship that draws off of heritages that come from, say, Syria or Algeria. So I've tried to think hard about, if we are in fact speaking or trying to speak as part of a whole field, how the structure and nature and knowledge produced in the books has to change. And that's been challenging for me 'cause my own grad education maybe didn't prepare me for it. So what I've done is I've tried to develop a Board that I think broadly represents both the field but also can speak to the absences in the field. And one of the things I would say as you think about where to publish is, you can look at the Board and that tells you where the series thinks it wants to go. So I would look at the constellation of text, I would look at the mission statement, decide if there's a place for your voice to expand that conversation. Then I would look at the Board as a signal as to where the series wants to go and see whether that meshes where you want to go as a writer. So the next thing would be editorial process. I should just say, well, one thing I want to say first is, even if you love SWR, it's like your dream home, I don't know, I think you should talk to several different series and talk to several different editors. Because a book takes about at least a year and a half to two years, and you want to know that the editor of that series respects your own writing process and that they'll give you the support that you need to succeed. And every editor's different. So you may find Pitt has a great editorial structure and other people may be like, well, Pitt, I wanted this and they didn't give it. But that's what SIU does. So I would talk to several series and really get a sense of their editorial process. And I would also do that because every editorial series has their mission, and no matter how beautiful and perfect your work is, their going to want you to tweak it to fit the collective goal of the series. And when you talk to different editors, you get a sense of how different people might imagine your series progressing. And you want to go with the series that most aligns with your values. And the other thing I say is that sometimes the rush to tenure and the need for the first book can make people cut their conscience to fit this year's sort of trendy topic. But the book's going to be with you for your whole career. So I think it's well worth thinking hard about the series and really deciding what parts of your book you will not give on. Like,

what are the topics, the theories, the ethics that you won't change even while you might change other things? And you maybe could talk to some of the senior scholars in your department about that. 'Cause there will be pressure to revise, there will be readers' reports, and there will be editorial vaults. And you want to make sure you're always true to your ethics when you write. To the editorial process, I'm sure it'll differ press by press, but my keyword for editorial process and writing the book is it should be fun, 'cause why shouldn't it be fun? And it should be supportive. Because why do we strand people alone by themselves in their offices writing by themselves? So with SWR, at least while I'm editor, I like to think that you can contact me at any stage in the process and have a conversation with me. You might have the full proposal developed and you want a set of eyes on it before you submit—maybe just makes you feel calmer. You might have a book idea and you want to let me know. You might have a set of ideas and you're wondering which one might be the one to develop. I'm always happy to chat with folks, and members of our Board are always happy to chat with you as well. My general goal is, good work should be published, and if SWR's not the venue, I will help you find other venues. So I think the first thing about doing a book and finding an editor is to decide their process, and for me, it should be the beginning of a conversation in which you feel the ethics and goals of your project are being supported. Once we have a conversation, I'm happy to look at drafts of the prospectus and the chapter that you have to submit. Once you submit it, I send it out to three to four reviewers. I almost always pick one that the author suggests, 'cause I'm sure that that person knows the work. I pick two people in the field, and then I pick one person absolutely unrelated to the project. Because to write for SWR is to write for the whole field, and I want the person unrelated to be able to understand the body of the project. It's sort of a way to make sure we keep our whole audience in mind. That takes about four weeks, sometimes five. When the reports come back, I send you the full report, and I set up a Skype session where we talk through the comments. I talk through the comments because if you're a first-time author, you can sometimes think it's—the comments are harsher than they are, that they're asking for more work than they require. And I also think it's important that the editor and the writer decide what they think is the best pathway forward to the book. That's really the moment when you have to decide if SWR's the venue for you, and I have to decide whether it sort of will speak to our audience. But it's a very friendly conversation, I assure that. At that conversation, I almost never ask for people to revise the prospectus, but I often, if we decide to proceed, ask you to send me the chapters written anew because that's really where the work happens, right? That's where the decisions are made. At that point, if it's useful for you in terms of tenure, we can issue a right-of-first-refusal contract. One of the things I talk about is, what is your tenure clock? 'Cause if you have a tenure clock, I want to make sure the process supports that so you don't live in fear. And if you're not on a tenure clock, then I want to make sure that it fits into your life just in general. As you're writing the chapters, I'm completely happy to read drafts of them. And one of the things that I like to do is have our Editorial Board occasionally work with a writer, so if a writer is developing something and there's this one element they're not sure of, our Editorial Board members will Skype with you, chat with you, read drafts. Because I think of you as joining a sort of editorial community. I don't want you to feel too stranded on your own. Once we've sort of worked through the chapters and you think they're ready, you resubmit the full manuscript, I then send it out to one person who read it before, one person in field, one person out of field, I get the comments. At that point you and I figure out what work has to be done to publish the book. I think if I commit to telling you to write the book, there should be a commitment that if you produce the full manuscript, I help you make sure that it's published. Again, you can ask somebody to write a whole book and then at the last minute say, "Uh, ya know, I was wrong about that, let's just move on." So the most important part of the process in

SWR is that conversation after the first reader reports, 'cause that's where we're making a set of commitments to each other. I know I kind of went into detail there, but what I would say is—now toggle back to general advice—this is the conversation you can have with editors before you submit your proposal. I mean, you can talk to Pitt and be like, "Here's what I'm thinking, can you tell me how you work with writers?" Now, some people might like sort of the very engaged back and forth with the editor if they're new writers or they're just generally trying to teach themselves a new topic, but if you're a more senior writer, you may not want that. You may want the readers' reports, and you write and send the book back in a year. So it's very important that you talk to folks. It really is the beginning of at least a two-year dialogue, and after your book's out, it's going to be further dialogue around marketing and stuff. The last thing I would add—I would add two last things. One is, as you can see with my less-than-adequate slide, at the bottom, we've redesigned the book so they have, like, actual covers, and the covers speak to the themes, and we're adding photos and all sorts of things inside. And, really thanks to Asao, we're thinking about how we might be able to do some open access publishing. And so the last thing I would say, and this is just a general thing, is I think with the exception of Malea and maybe Cristina Kirklighter, maybe Victor, there've been very few scholars of color who've edited book series and journals. And that's often kind of true of editorial reports too. So that's why we created the Fellows Program, where we help people learn how to do this work. I would highly recommend to anyone who's thinking of doing editorial work, to really just write to editors and say you would like to know how to do this. The field is better the broader the editorial community is. And so I'm happy to chat with you about that, but I would just end with saying, don't just imagine you want to publish; imagine you want to edit. 'Cause it's huge amounts of fun, you meet great people, and you learn just a ton of stuff. I think that's ten minutes, so I'll stop.

Yeah, thank you so much, Dr. Parks. While we are waiting for Dr. Hassel to join, I want to take a question that we have from an anonymous attendee whose question is directed towards Dr. Powell. The question is, what's the statute of limitation for CCC's Interchanges? That is, how recent should an article be to send in a response?

I would say generally it should be, it should have been published in the last year. And partly that's because of how long the publication process is. And so, if you send an Interchange that was written a year, a response that was written a year ago, that person wrote that article like two years ago. And so I think that, within the last year, I think for me, is what I'd like to stick with. If there is a larger issue that you want to take up, that appeared in CCC over time, even before me, before Jonathan, whenever, contact me about that and we can talk about what that would look like.

Okay, thank you. Dr. Hassel is here now. I would like to invite Dr. Hassel for her presentation now.

Thank you, can you hear me okay?

Yeah.

Okay, great. So, again, just reiterating, thanks to everyone, Christine Cucciarre and CCC and NCTE for organizing this. I think it's a really exciting opportunity to share some perspectives that most folks don't really get to hear about. So, I am Holly Hassel, the editor of *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*. I've been doing this work for about four years now. I'm coming to the end of my term, so you know, I guess there's things I wish I would have been able to do or get done and things that I did get done. So I'll talk a little bit about my kind of experience, my editorial philosophy, as well as a little bit about the journal itself and its mission. One of the things that's important for me to highlight, I would say, is the relationship between *TETYC* as a journal and TYCA. So TYCA, the Two-Year College Association, is an affiliate of the National Council of Teachers of English and, like CCC, which is a conference [journal], has a little bit of a different relationship for me personally because *TETYC* is a teaching-focused journal, because it responds to and is, really, I would say, the primary journal that supports the work of teacher-scholar activists in the field. It's been really important to me to be responsive in the same way I kind of heard Malea talking about, be responsive to the needs of the field, be responsive to readers, but also be responsive to what I'm experiencing and hearing from our Executive Committee. The TYCA Executive Committee is a very, is a little bit different from other governance bodies, in that it is representative, literally, sort of regional representatives are elected to serve. And so there's voices from all across the different type of regions, so that's been a really important kind of source of value for me in hearing about, what are the issues and needs that two-year college teachers have. I would say the special issue topics that I focused on this last, during my term, including labor, graduate preparation of two-year college English teachers, and then upcoming special issues on dual credit courses, current enrollment programs, have all come directly from concerns and issues that were raised by the TYCA Executive Committee and things that they were hearing from their regions. So that was important for me. Thank you. Hey, there's the regions. You can see them. Okay, we can go to the next slide. So just a little bit of background about this journal. Two things, I would say, make it a little bit different from CCC or SWR; one is that it's very explicitly focused on teaching, right? It's in the title. It's very explicitly focused on the two-year college. That does mean that, for example, you can see in the description of sort of the work that we do, that it's, I look for pieces that are specific to two-year college teaching and also in the first two college years, but teaching and learning has to be central. So that means that a lot of research that maybe is, would be appropriate for, or pieces that would be appropriate for CCC or *College English* would not necessarily be a fit for *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, even if they deal with, for example, first-year writing or introductory courses. One point I will make as well about this is that this *TETYC* is not just a writing studies journal, right, it's not just a composition and rhetoric journal, which is, again, I would say different from CCC or SWR. So, when I talk about the kind of field of two-year college English, as you can see from the description, that is a bit more expansive, right? More along the lines of what *College English*, the editorial philosophy of *College English*, in that we will, I'll receive and publish articles across the English studies. And so that's another, I would say, important thing to be thinking about if you're interested in *TETYC* as a publication home. And then, if you can go to the next slide? Thanks. So there's different types of submissions and, in part, some of these you'll see are reflective of kinds of pieces that I also heard Malea talking about a little bit that have been in *College English* as well. So, for example, the review essay you can see, the fifth one down, our symposiums, but then we also have traditional sort of feature articles that are, again, sort of research based. But because *TETYC* is

aimed at the busy teacher-scholar in a two-year college, most of whom, as I'm learning from some work I'm doing right now on the TYCA Workload Committee, are teaching five five, or six six, sometimes seven courses a semester. *TETYC* has to serve a really particular function for those folks, right? So has to be focused on classroom practices or sort of administration and research resources that are going to help people do their work better, right? In the classroom, it's primarily a teaching focus. So you can see we have a couple of different kinds of pieces here. Instructional Notes, those are a little bit shorter than a feature article. They might describe a classroom approach. Could be a particular lesson, it could be a curricular approach, it could be an assessment approach, but the idea there is that it's very specifically connected to classroom work and also situated within scholarship on teaching and learning. That's a little bit distinct from what works for me, which is much briefer; again, that's intended to be kind of classroom-ready. Like, if I'm a first-year writing teacher at a two-year college, I want to pick up *TETYC* and say, "I'm looking for something kind of engaging and interesting and innovative to do in my class today, oh, here we go, this is great, this is cool," right? And then the same with the review, or similar with the review, for folks who have a really teaching-intensive position, they want to know about and be engaged in scholarship, but maybe don't have quite as much time to allocate for their professional reading, and so it was one of the reasons for review essays, a way to kind of help readers understand what's new, what's out there, and what's worth their time. Similarly with the symposium, a way to sort of help readers think about the professional conversations that are happening, who maybe don't have that as their primary duty. And then, last, a personal essay; this has been a sort of topic that's not, or a type of piece that has appeared previously in the journal quite a bit, but wasn't really called that. And I know it's something that for readers whose primary work is teaching, there's a lot of need for and opportunity to, and joy that comes from thinking about that work, and so that's a kind of a genre I wanted to foreground as well in the journal. In terms of editorial decisions, I would say pretty similar to some of what we've heard already today. I think there's quite a range in terms of how many, what sort of proportion of submissions editors decide to desk reject and which ones they send out for review. I think from what I've, conversations I've heard with other editors, it can be really variable. I would say I tend to send out more pieces for review than I do reject myself. I'm in, you know, I want the journal and editorial process and the submission process to be a dialogue, to be a conversation, to be an opportunity for professional development, so that if someone's, especially for new authors or authors who maybe are professionals in the field, have been professionals in the field for a long time but haven't had scholarship as the primary work that they do, I want there to be a way for them to participate and share the knowledge that they've developed over the years about teaching and learning. And so, so I tend to send out much, a higher percentage of pieces than I do just to reject them. But when I do, say, send something back without sending it out for review, it tends to be because it's not aligned with the journal mission, right? If it's, maybe it doesn't address teaching in a substantive way, or maybe it's just an add-on, or it might sort of not really recognize the audience very well, right, so it focuses on a student population or a type of program that just isn't a two-year college program or student, right? Or submissions that I've received that are focused on graduate students, okay, well we, that's not, that's not what we do, right? So that's not a good fit for this journal. And then, second, that question of, and again I think this, it varies, say from my perspective, writers can have a more successful experience with a Revise and Resubmit if they can demonstrate that they've really considered the review feedback, right? I will say when I get reviews or reader reports, I send them out to three, to three reviewers, to three readers. And there's always a kind of judgment process associated with when you get reviews back. You know, what does that mean? Especially if there's mixed perspectives. If I'm coming with a

Revise and Resubmit recommendation to an author, like others have said, that generally means we're interested, we think there's something really great here. We want to see how, further work to make it more of a good fit for the journal audience and purpose. I'd say it makes, I'm more likely to, or a writer can be more successful with a Revise and Resubmit recommendation if they're showing very carefully how they've thought about the reviewer feedback. I will say, when I send a decision letter, I try to curate or sort of help the writer prioritize, right? What should I do with these three reviews? Especially if they've got, they're all focused on different things or sometimes maybe even have conflicting recommendations, right? So I see that as my job, to kind of help a writer understand, what am I supposed to do with this feedback? And then a writer can be more successful with a Revise and Resubmit if they can demonstrate, even if you didn't decide to take all the advice, which I think is fine, and I, you know, that's fine, right? If the writer says, "Well, reviewer two said start over," or whatever, right? Like, or your methodology needs work, "but I clarified it, but decided not to actually follow XYZ thing," I think as long as you're demonstrating, like, "I've thoughtfully considered this feedback, here's how I've decided which to use and what not to, and here's why," right? That's very satisfying to me as an editor. In terms of topics, I wanted to just highlight some of the things that right now I would say are current topics of interest. These are issues that I see as very specific, not totally specific, but real, more prevalent in two-year colleges. Two-year colleges serve the largest percentage of multilingual writers, generation 1.5 writers, refugee students—you know, so anything that's going to help instructors and two-year college faculty do that work better. Online writing instruction is much more prevalent, from what I've read and seen, in two-year colleges than it is in more research-intensive institutions, so again, I think people are always looking for ways to do that work better. And then other kinds of more national trends around sort of developmental education, accelerating students from nondegree credit courses to credit-bearing courses, writing studio, and of course social justice issues in the two-year college, those are, again, all sort of things I'm continuing to look for. And I think that's it. Feel free to email me.

Thank you so much, all three of you. That was a great conversation. Now we'll open the floor for some questions, and we already have some. The first, we already asked the first question, so the second question that we received is someone who teaches at a Christian college and they are, they really want to know if any of the editors can speak to those of us who might like to publish, but who do not know if our Christian worldview would be embraced as diverse among the many other voices active in the field today. How might you see a professor such as myself as contributing to the conversation?

I can start a little bit. I mean I think that when I say "diverse" I mean diverse in a number of ways. Broadly diverse in terms of representative of readers and scholars and students and teachers in the discipline, and so for me, I think, if you're writing an article that outlines a specific situation and the work that you have done in that situation, that counts as diverse, right? I want that diversity to be broad. I know there's a lot of scholarship right now in rhetoric studies on religious rhetorics and religious schools, and so I think that it certainly would count for me.

There we go, I'm on mute. I think I would have two responses. One is, I think that there's an established and growing body of scholarship that looks at Christian rhetoric, Christian communities, but just as sort

of a historical analysis of how that rhetoric operates. And right now, when sort of Christianity has been reduced into the public sphere into a very narrow bandwidth of this actually quite broad and diverse traditions, books that do that type of work would be valuable to the field. I think also in your question, isn't so much, "Could I do a historical study, but could I speak from a Christian perspective?" I think if you look at Beverly Moss's work, that's what she's doing. And I think there are scholars out there who are writing from their perception of what a Christian tradition would be. I do think there's probably some reluctance within the field to maybe publish certain types of Christian ideology when it's connected to, sort of, hate groups, but I think there's a lot of very interesting Christian theories and beliefs, like liberation theology, for instance, which could in fact sort of inform our debate. So I think it's trying to explain to the editor how this framework within this system of belief could inform how we teach writing, understand rhetoric, and sort of some of our broader goals. That would be, I think, how I would approach that.

I mean, I say a little bit about it. For *TETYC*, I mean, I think, again, it would be sort of, as others have said, like, what does that look like, sort of? In the way that you're addressing your topic. How is it influencing your topic? I think talking about it in the context of the classroom and the context of your teacher identity, how does this become a pressing issue for you or for your students? That would be an important context to provide in order to sort of communicate what's significant about this issue of Christian—whether it's an identity or rhetoric, or whatever component of it. Why is it interesting or important to readers, right?

I would just add to that—I can point to books that sort of emerged from a Christian tradition, but I can point to almost no books in the field that emerged from an Islamic tradition, Hindu tradition, so I think the notion of expanding our rhetoric and models to include Christianity has somewhat been done, but we have been less successful and more of a failure at expanding this, sort of, like Islam and other religions. I would hope diversity would include those as well.

So now we have another question, so this is directed toward Dr. Parks. I'm interested in revising my dissertation into a book; I would like to know if you are interested in such works; if so, what is the process involved in it?

Actually, probably all of us could speak to it, probably all worked with graduate students and their dissertations, but I would say this: there's sort of a bias against publishing people's dissertations, and I think that some people imagine that because it's like a young scholar. But that's not really the concern. The concern is the writerly voice you develop during a dissertation is a negotiated [set] done with your committee and speaks to the local politics of that program. So that voice isn't really the same writerly voice you would put in the *CCC* journal or you would publish in other journals or in a book series. So I think that before you sort of approach writing the dissertation, sending the dissertation in, you should have some evidence on your CV that you've published in a journal. That way you show you've made the transition from sort of dissertation writer, to sort of more public writer in the field. And there's a bunch

of subtle differences in how that looks, and actually SWR has an editorial, a video series, and Ellen Cushman addresses this question directly. The other thing I would say is, and this is sad to say, that dissertations aren't structured like books. And that when you send in your five-chapter dissertation, it looks like a dissertation, and you should work with your committee to either do your dissertation differently, or have someone on your committee help you explain how you would have to restructure it to turn it into a book. Like the second chapter, the method chapter. That's not really, like, standard in a lot of books I read, but it's standard in a dissertation. So what I would just quickly summarize: I would have a publication that shows you can do the writerly author public voice, I would work with someone to restructure the chapters so they read like a book, but I would also say that I really believe that this generation of scholars is just smashing a lot of the boundaries that the field that I helped construct had real limitations to. So I think you should absolutely push for your research to get published. I would find a mentor who could help you put it in a format that'll help it be understood by editors. And I don't know if anybody's worked with grad students and would want to speak to that issue.

And I can, actually, come at that from—when you send me a dissertation chapter that's just a dissertation chapter, that's what it looks like. That doesn't mean we're not going to work with you to publish it or we're not going to send it out or you're not going to get good advice. It means you have to reorient yourself in terms of who you're speaking to and how you're speaking. My example of that is my very first publication in CCC, right, that "Rhetorics of Survivance" piece. That's everything that's worth publishing from my dissertation, that's like five times longer. And that had to, that was a, that had to be a reorientation that I worked through with mentors, but it is a very different thing to do. And if you're working with mentors right now who are encouraging you to publish, you should talk to them about developing that as a voice throughout at least parts of your dissertation, rather than just produce the dissertation for the institution and then have to do all of the heavy lifting afterwards, when you don't have all that mentorship and guidance.

Thank you so much. We are kind of running out of time, so I'm picking some questions. So here's one: what would be your key piece of advice to early career graduate students who have not published before and who are trying to dive into the process? And this question speaks a lot to me as well, so I'd really appreciate your answer.

I can start with that. I would say, one of the things that I think is important is to think very strategically about why you're publishing and for what purpose, right? So that the dissertation-into-a-book question made me think a lot about how, you know some of it might depend on the kind of job you have, the kind of position you have. I mean that's not, sometimes actually a lot of places, probably most places, the expectation of like a monograph—that's not the criterion for tenure. Maybe you're working off the tenure track and that's not a criterion that's, you know, it's not rewarded. And so, for folks who are working in those kind of positions, which is a lot, then publication becomes about a very different thing, right? It's not just about something that you do, that you exchange with your institution for tenure. It's sort of: What conversation am I contributing to? How is this going to align with or fit with the other work that I'm doing, right? That became really important for me as someone who was working in a

teaching-intensive position. It was on the tenure track, but it was four four. And so I found that the most valuable and useful work that I could write for publication was that it intersected with the day-to-day work that I did, right? Which was teaching first-year writing. And so my advice would be to just think in a very careful way about how is your professional work going to be kind of synergistic with all the components of it, and not as a separate thing over here.

Yeah, I would add to that that I think there's a huge pressure to feel you should publish early. And often that means that you'll send out work in a call to a CFP that isn't really related to your work, but you want to get published. And I feel like it's not worth getting published in a marginal area to your general framework. And I think it's wise to listen to your mentors about when you're ready to publish. Publishing something that isn't very good is not going to help you, and you're better off waiting a bit and having a very solid piece of writing. And in some ways, having a great piece of writing for the job market that's just a dis chapter can be more valuable than being published in a venue where you didn't have good editorial support and you ended up publishing something you're going to regret in twenty years. And the third thing I would say, and this is my advice throughout your career, is be informed by your ethics when you publish. There should be certain things you refuse to revise about your writing that mark who you are as a scholar. And when you're beginning and you haven't been published and you're terrified of the market, you might be tempted to cut those corners. But cutting those corners then sets a pattern. And so you should stick with your values, and if it takes another year to get published, you'll sleep well at night. And that's more valuable than sort of a publication that you regret for the next twenty years.

And I just want to briefly add to this. I think that what Holly says—about why are you publishing? Why do you want to publish in that place? What is it doing for you? How is it related to what your work is at that moment?—are really important questions. I also think that finding mentors who will help you, whether they are faculty mentors, maybe other grad students, or other early career faculty—coming to conferences and finding your people and finding mentors there, you don't have to be in the greatest program with the greatest mentors to get good mentoring around your writing. You just have to find those mentors. And that is for your whole career. That's your lifelong process, right? Steve is mentoring me right now. And I think that those are—figuring out how your career is going to work and what your life is, and what your job is, that's where your publications come from, right? And so that's the trick, and finding people who will give you good advice is the key to all of that.

All right, I think we can, we have time for one more question. So can you speak to this issue of financial pressure on publishing? How do you think that will shape publishing in your journal or series going into the future near and far?

I mean, I think this is something that Steve and I have talked about extensively in terms of our desire to pull more and more of the exchange that happens around scholarship into webspace, right? So, you know, one of the totally hilarious things I said when I interviewed for this position was that I wanted to

be able to have a whole issue in the volume series of CCC that was online, multimodal. That requires a lot of, sort of like, back end, so even online journals, you know, I created one in a past life; they're not free. There's always labor involved, there's software involved, there's technology involved. I think that for me, making our conversations accessible is the most important thing, but I think that the cost of print publishing is always going to be an issue as we move forward, and I think it's something that NCTE and CCCC has to look at pretty seriously with a lot of these journals that are paper only.

Yeah, I mean I, because I run this other press, I've thought way too much about this. I think print-on-demand has changed publishing because you can just publish as many books as you sell. And I think that lessens the pressure. I think if you're within a large bureaucracy, some of the online costs can be distributed. But I think the overwhelming issue in academic publishing right now is the cost of the books. I think if you're a grad student and you're asked to pay \$70 by Routledge for a book you might use one article out of, I think that just tells you the value of that series, and it necessarily excludes working-class or working-poor grad students. So I think that we have to come up with a model where we think about who buys our books and match the economics to what their means are. And I also think that one of the issues in academic publishing is—the books don't sell. Now some of that is grad students xerox the books and PDF them for free all over the country. I have benefited from this; I'm not gonna take a moral stance on it, but I think when we continue to publish with such a narrow bandwidth, we limit our readers. And so I think what the academics have to think hard about, and presses have to think hard about, is how do we speak to the whole field so that the whole field will want to read it? And how do we write in a way that can engage the public? I truly believe, and I think a lot of people believe, is that what we say has public meaning and impact. So we have to start publishing the writing that will make the public realize that. So I don't think it's just economic; I think it's also how we imagine our audience and the value of our work.

Thank you so much for enthusiastically participating in this webinar. The recording of this video will be available to all the participants who had registered for this event, and eventually this will be put on NCTE's website. And in the meantime, if you have any questions, feel free to email our editors, or you can email your questions to ccc@ncte.org, and our lovely Kristen [Suchor] will redirect your questions towards an editor. I know we were not able to answer so many questions because of the limitation of time, and I hope you will send your questions to the editors and have direct connections. So this is the end of our webinar, and I would like to thank you, Dr. Inoue, Dr. Christine Tulley, and Dr. Christina Cedillo, Christine Cucciarre, and Lisa Fink for working behind the background and making this happen. And have a wonderful day. Thank you.