



WINTER 2012

From the Editor

With this issue, we are now into our third volume. I would like to share with you some very positive information regarding *Advances in Engineering Education*. As of February 2012, we have received a total of 484 submissions, including 139 revisions or resubmissions. Overall, we have accepted 24 percent of the papers submitted. However, as many of our authors have come to learn, most of those papers were accepted after one or even two revisions. Specifically, over 80% of the papers that have been accepted first required a revision and re-review. Once revised, half of the resubmissions have been accepted. The message to authors is clear – do not give up, if your first effort requires a revision, even a major revision! Please carefully consider the reviewers' comments and revise accordingly.

Of course, not every paper will go through the review cycle. To date, a third of the papers submitted to *AEE* have been rejected by an editor prior to sending out for review. A primary reason for rejection is the lack of an assessment section that documents the “advance” which the authors are presenting. A few papers are also rejected because they require a more substantial background section, and/or the pedagogy upon which the paper is based is not sufficiently addressed. In addition, a very small number of papers are returned because they simply describe a research project, without an application and assessment. Finally, we have rejected a small percentage of papers as being inappropriate for *AEE*; i.e., they are better suited for a technical journal in the authors' field than an engineering education publication.

We are also becoming an international journal! Colleagues who live outside of the United States have submitted almost a fifth of our papers. As this issue documents – these papers are being published – note Suk Meng Goh's paper that uses “Star Power” in a most creative manner to teach professional skills to engineering students at Curtin University of Technology in Sarawak, Malaysia.

We are also proud of the fact that we are not only being read, but our articles are being cited in the engineering education literature, as indicated by the most recent calculations tabulated by Scopus. While we have a long way to go before we reach the level of our sister publication - the *Journal of Engineering Education*, we are already competitive with the other seven major engineering education publications, and our articles, after only eight issues, are being cited more often than those in some journals that have been around much longer than *AEE*.

Still we have a few areas for improvement. One is reducing our turn-around times. We are working on tightening the process, which is dependent on a chain of volunteers - editor, associate editor, reviewers, associate editor again, and finally editor all to respond in a timely manner. This is a goal



of the editorial board - we would like to limit the review process to less than three months. As a reviewer, you can help us, by responding promptly, but thoroughly when asked to review a paper.

A bit more about this current issue - it contains nine papers. As with our other issues, they cover a wide range of topics of interest to the engineering education community. Each documents an advance that has been cleverly developed and evaluated. We have already noted Suk Meng Goh's paper. Check out Matt Liberatore and colleagues "Youtube Fridays" - where students select videos that relate to course topics (an idea I am going to try with my engineering ethics course). Catherine Amelink and her colleagues focus on improving student learning with a Tablet PC, while Amy Orange and her colleagues address other issues of technology in the classroom. Stephanie Farrell and her colleagues at Rowan University have developed a large problem set that introduces concepts of pharmaceutical engineering to students. Rupa Iyer and Melinda Wales have developed a modular, interdisciplinary biotechnology laboratory curriculum that could fit into a variety of courses. A team from four universities presents effective, computer-based finite element active learning modules. Luciano Barroso and Jim Morgan present a creative, dynamics and vibrations course for civil engineers. Last, but certainly not least, James Hanson and Patrick Brophy describe the critical incident technique - a cognitive method for obtaining valuable information from experienced professionals.

Happy reading!

Larry J. Shuman
Editor-in-Chief