

Board of Journal of Industrial Technology (JIT Board) Minutes
Wednesday, October 24, 2007

Meeting Called to Order: 1:00 p.m.

Members in Attendance:

Dr. Charles Patrick (JIT Board Chair), Dr. Ron Meier (Industry Division Representative),
Dr. Bruce DeRuntz (At-Large Representative and JIT Editorial Panel member).

Members Absent:

Mr. Steven Brown (CCTI Division Representative), Dr. Michael Hayden (University
Division Representative), Ms. Hiral Shah (Student Division Representative), Dr. Wafeek
Wahby (At-Large Representative).

JIT Editorial Panel Members in Attendance:

Dr. John Wright (Chief Editor), Dr. Bruce DeRuntz (Associate Editor), and Dr. William
Brauer (in-coming Chief Editor)

Opening Remarks:

- Chair Patrick welcomed everyone to the meeting. He also expressed concern about the absences of several members on the board.
- Minutes of November 2006 Board meeting were approved.

Board and Editorial Panel Membership:

- JIT Board membership review
 - The terms of both the Industry Division representative and one At-Large representative expired in 2007. Without objection, Dr. Ron Meier, Industry Division representative, and Dr. Bruce DeRuntz, At-Large representative, were reappointed as members on the JIT Board. Dr. Meier and Dr. DeRuntz will be recommended for reappointment to the NAIT Executive Board at their next meeting on Saturday, Oct. 27, 2007.
 - Without objection, the board accepted the resignation of Ms. Hiral Shah, Student Division representative. Ms. Shah contacted Chair Patrick prior to the JIT Board meeting with her resignation due to the planned completion of her degree in December 2007. The board expressed thanks to Ms. Shah for her service to the board during the past two years. The board discussed potential replacements for the Student Division representative. Members agreed to continue the search for a representative from current IT graduate students, preferably a doctoral student due to the potential for longevity in the board position.
- JIT Editorial Panel membership review
 - Without objection, the board accepted the resignation of Dr. John Wright, Chief Editor, and Dr. Ali Kashef, Associate Editor from the JIT Editorial Panel. The board thanked both Dr. Wright and Dr. Kashef for their service during the past two years. The board noted the excellent leadership of Dr. Wright as Chief Editor and commended him for his work in the implementation of the Editorial Panel with the JIT review process.
 - Without objection, the board approved the appointment of Dr. William Brauer as Chief Editor on the panel. Dr. Brauer served as the JIT editor for one year several years prior to the implementation of the Editorial Panel. The board noted Dr. Brauer's experience and

was appreciative of his willingness to assume the Chief Editor's responsibilities on the panel.

- The board noted the planned transition of Dr. Bruce DeRuntz from the Assistant to Associate Editor on the panel. Discussion followed about potential candidates for the Assistant Editor position. Several names of experienced JIT referees were suggested by board members from the current list of referees, including Steve Freeman, Steve Hsiung, Bruce Marsh, and Joyce Wilkerson. Chair Patrick agreed to ask these candidates about their willingness to serve on the panel at the conference and inform the JIT Board. A selection of Assistant Editor will be conducted by the board via email after a viable candidate is found.

Old Business

- Brief review of JIT Board bylaws was provided by Chair Patrick.
- The board discussed JIT Board recommendations to the NAIT Executive Board (EB) from the previous year – initially presented in November 2006 at convention EB meeting. John Wright, vice-chair of the EB, reported on the action related to the potential partnership between the NAIT and IJME organizations. [*IJME – International Journal of Modern Engineering*] He stated that the NAIT Executive Office was working on details for a joint conference in 2008 and was confident that collaboration would be forthcoming. Discussion followed on potential methods of cooperation between the JIT and IJME journals, with the possible review of conference papers from both organizations by the associated editorial panels being the primary suggestion. Chair Patrick agreed to discuss this potential cooperation with Dr. Mark Rajai, IJME Editor-in-Chief and inform the JIT Board of the results.
- Chair Patrick reported on updates to the article review criteria and related article evaluation forms used by the Editorial Panel and referees.

New Business

JIT review statistics - 2007

- John Wright reported a total of twelve (12) articles reviewed from Jan. 1 to Oct. 24, 2007. Of these four (4) were accepted for publication and eight (8) were rejected, resulting in a 33% acceptance and 67% rejection rate for the reviewed articles during that time period. Two (2) additional articles were accepted as “non-refereed” publications.

JIT review process

- Board members suggested a “recusal” statement be developed for the JIT Editorial Panel and referees regarding the review of articles for which panel members or referees recognize the author (or authors). The intent is to develop a policy statement in which a panel member or referee would remove themselves from participation in an article review on grounds such as prejudice or personal involvement with the author (or authors). Chair Patrick volunteered to work on this statement for review by the Board and potential inclusion in the JIT Board By-Laws.
- Board members expressed concern about the recognition of the author (or authors) of articles by Editorial Panel members or referees. Two concerns were raised:

1. Once an article is approved for review by the Editorial Panel, there have been occasions where the article was sent to referees at the same institution of the author(s) of the article. This would likely cause a conflict of interest for the referee; it is possible the referee would recognize the topic and associate it with the author(s), who would likely be in the same academic department or program.
2. JIT referees are “blinded” to the Editorial Panel and author(s) by a numbering system; each referee has a designated number assigned that is placed on the evaluation forms returned to the Panel members and author(s). The concern is that the number assigned to long-term referees is eventually recognizable to some Panel members and author(s), especially those authors who have been publishing and refereeing for the JIT for a long period of time.

JIT Board members recommended the following to the JIT Administrator:

Request for Action #1: When possible, articles approved by the Editorial Panel for review should not be sent to referees in the same institution as the author or authors. It is understood that there may be occasions when insufficient referees are available for specialized topic articles. Thus these articles may have to go to referees at the same institutions as the author or authors of the article.

Request for Action #2: If feasible, change the referee identification number on an annual basis. This will assure that referees are not easily recognized by their ID number.

Suggestion for JIT Copy-Editor

JIT Board members discussed the need of a technical copy-editor for the JIT. There was general agreement that referees should be spending most of their review time on the content of articles, although basic formatting should be reviewed as well. The members agreed that a copy-editor would greatly aid this problem and would add consistency of format to the diversity of topics in JIT articles. Board members suggested asking NAIT to fund a copy-editor for the JIT. The cost of a technical copy-editor was approximated as follows: based on 12 to 15 papers published annually at an average 12 pages each copy edited at \$10-\$15 per page results in an annual cost of a minimum of \$1,440 (12 papers x 12 pages ea. x \$10 per page) to a maximum of \$2,700 (15 papers x 12 pages ea. x \$15 per page).

Request for Action #3: The JIT Board requests funding for \$2,000 annually from the NAIT Executive Board to fund a technical copy-editor position for review/revision of approved JIT articles.

Article evaluation forms

- JIT Board members expressed concern about the format of the article review criteria and evaluation forms. It was the general opinion of the members that there are discrepancies within the current evaluation forms --- the introductory descriptions do not match up well with the table descriptions where referees actually provide comments. Chair Patrick volunteered to work on these forms and get to the JIT Board for approval and eventual incorporation into the review process.

Article review period

- There was a discussion about the one-month review period provided to JIT referees to review articles. One member thought this time period was too long and suggested it be reduced to two (2) weeks. After discussion, the one-month period was decided appropriate.

Sample article posted on NAIT-JIT web site

- There was a request by one Board member to post sample articles on the NAIT-JIT web site for potential authors. Chair Patrick volunteered to work with the Editorial Panel and the JIT Administrator to get this accomplished.

NAIT-JIT web site

- There was a discussion on the NAIT-JIT web site. Several concerns were expressed about the format of the site. Chair Patrick stated that he would work with the NAIT Executive office to begin the reorganization of the online site.

JIT referee training

- Chair Patrick announced two (2) training sessions for JIT reviewers were scheduled during Wednesday and Thursday of the NAIT convention. An overview of the training session content was provided to the Board. Discussion followed on the JIT article review process, the reviewer training session, and JIT reviewer qualifications.
- Chair Patrick asked for input on offering the JIT refereed training online through the NAIT web site. All members agreed this was a good idea. Chair Patrick agreed to work with the NAIT Executive office to develop this capability.

JIT “Fellow” discussion

- Dr. DeRuntz discussed the possible development of a distinguished NAIT “Fellow” process. Members generally agreed on the idea of a NAIT Fellow; however, it was agreed to bring this back for discussion at the 2008 Board meeting due to the abundance of recent changes in the JIT review process.

Meeting Adjourned: 2:45 p.m.