

# **COLLEGE MUSIC SYMPOSIUM**

## **GUIDELINES FOR COMPONENT EDITORS**

### **1. Introduction:**

*Symposium* issues are officially released twice a year in pdf/JSTOR format, **Summer/Fall (ca Aug-Sept)** and **Winter/Spring (ca Feb-March)**. Submissions that have been accepted for publication are assigned to a specific issue but may be released online before an entire pdf issue is completed. This is especially the case with Forum essays that appear online every month. Please note, balance and overall plan of the issues, including special guest-edited issues, will have a determining factor in the release date of an item.

Manuscript submission deadlines for Article authors (presently Scholarship and MBI) and Performance video are **February 1; September 1**. Authors can submit any time of the year they choose, but Editors are only required to review incoming material on these dates. Normally, a Feb. 1 accepted submission will be ready for the Summer/Fall issue (Aug-Sept), and a Sept 1 accepted submission should be ready for the Winter/Spring (Feb-March) issue.

Reviews of books, tech, and audio are never unsolicited. However, anyone can submit Review *material* that they would like the *Symposium* to consider for review. This can be done through the online *Symposium* review material form. But regardless of how items are submitted, all will be evaluated by editors, and if deemed suitable, will be forwarded to specialist reviewers who write the *Symposium* reviews.

It is not mandatory, but it is greatly preferred that reviewers, board members, and authors be CMS members, especially for Forums. N.B., only CMS members can login and comment or reply to Forum comments.

Some manuscripts or even review items are more suitable for other Editors or Component areas than the one to which they were submitted. In fact, any Component editor, including Review editors, can serve as an Article editor, and any Article editor can serve as a Review editor, depending on their specialty and the nature of the submission (this is permissible, as each abstract has an editor pulldown menu where names and details can be modified). If you feel a submission is better handled by another Editor or Component, contact the General Editor with your recommendation and he/she will follow up.

### **2. Editorial Boards.**

For those Components that have them, Editorial Boards serve as a ready team that takes an active interest in the success of the journal. As such, not only do Board Members serve as potential referees and reviewers, but they also encourage and solicit submissions, or if called upon, write articles themselves. When editors invite individuals

to join the Board (for a 3-year appointment), editors are to clearly inform Board Members of their responsibilities. Board Members who are consistently inactive in promoting and supporting the *Symposium* Component may be removed from the Board.

N.B., If Editors ascertain that upcoming issues will be under quota, Editors should contact their Boards for assistance. This is their job, to help make sure the Component has a healthy submission cycle.

### 3. Referees and Reviewers.

**Note:** Since the *Symposium* publishes many Reviews of materials (books, audio, tech, performance), the term “reviewer” will be applied to those who are writing short Reviews that will be published, and “referee” (i.e., peer reviewers) will be used for those who are assessing manuscript submissions for suitability and quality.

The *Symposium* uses **double-blind review**: author identities are concealed from the referees, and referee identities are concealed from authors. For Reviews, the submitters only discover the name of the reviewer once the review is published.

**a. Database of Referees and Reviewers:** *Symposium* maintains a database of potential referees and reviewers. Through the *Symposium* website, CMS members can indicate their interest in serving by submitting their credentials and a brief biography on an online form. All Editors will have access to this database (updated at least monthly), and by using a search function, can find experts on a specific topic who are willing to serve as a referee or reviewer.

**b. Article Referees** (peer reviewers) may be chosen from members of a Component’s Board, but Editors also have the right to solicit outside referees who may be experts on a particular topic, or to choose referees from the *Symposium* referee database.

**c. Reviewers** of materials and performances may be chosen from the reviewer database or Editors can solicit outside Reviewers who are experts on a particular topic. Performances, Lectures, Lecture-Recitals (PLL) which need both referees and reviewers can call upon its Board Members, use the CMS referee database, or seek outside specialists. An individual who serves as a PLL referee of a performance/lecture can also serve as the published reviewer and write the review, as determined by the PLL Editor.

### 4. *Symposium* Issue Tentative Goals

Scholarship and Research:	3-4 articles per issue (6-8 per year)
Music Business-Industry:	3-4 articles per issue (6-8 per year)
Performances, Lect, Lect-Rec:	2-3 per issue (4-6 per year)

Book Reviews:	4-5 per issue (8-10 per year)
Tech/Online Reviews:	5-6 per issue (10-12 per year)
Audio Reviews:	5-6 per issue (10-12 per year)
Forums:	6 per issue (12 per year)

***Editors will do their best to meet their quotas***

**5. a. Article/Performance Tentative Timeline:**

**SUMMER/FALL ISSUE**

Feb. 1	<b>Deadline:</b> editors begin to assess author submissions, accept or reject as suitable
March 1	all suitable material is sent to referees by this date
April 1 and 15	editors send 2 reminder emails to all referees about their upcoming May 1 deadline
May 1	<b>Deadline.</b> editors receive referee feedback; readied items go onto General Editor. Revision suggestions go back to authors.  <b>Deadline.</b> By May 1 editors must have filled in the spreadsheet of the anticipated Component publications for Summer/Fall issue
June 1	Receive author article revisions, resubmit to referees for 2 <sup>nd</sup> look and final approval or Component Editor can make final determination without referees at this stage
July 1	<b>Deadline.</b> Referees submit responses to revised material to Editors who have final say on publication. If Editors approve, items are passed onto General Editor for Summer/Fall issue
<b>Aug-Sept</b>	<b>Summer/Fall pdf issue published</b>

**WINTER/SPRING ISSUE**

Sept 1	<b>Deadline:</b> editors begin to assess author submissions, accept or reject as suitable
Oct 1	all suitable material is sent to referees or reviewers by this date
Nov 1 and 15	editors send 2 reminder emails to all referees about their upcoming Dec 1 deadline.

Dec 1	<b>Deadline.</b> editors receive referee feedback; readied items go onto General Editor. Revision suggestions go to authors.  <b>Deadline.</b> By Dec. 1 editors must have filled in the spreadsheet of the anticipated publications for Winter/Fall issue
Jan 1	Receive author article revisions, resubmit to referees for 2 <sup>nd</sup> look and final approval or Component Editor can make final determination without referees at this stage
Feb 1	<b>Deadline.</b> Referees submit responses to revised material to Editors who have final say on publication. If Editors approve, items are passed onto General Editor for Winter/Spring issue
<b>Feb/March</b>	<b>Winter/Spring pdf issue published</b>

### b. Reviews Tentative Timeline

Review Editors should check the CMS submission database on Feb 1 and Sept 1 and address any submissions without delay. That said, often review material does not flow to a Review Editor on set dates. Frequently the Editor discovers the material to review him/herself, or may even be contacted directly by a submitter. Regardless, Review Editors must keep their quotas and certain deadlines in mind, as noted below:

Nov. 15:	submit any early readied reviews if available that might be released online before upcoming Winter/Spring issue
Dec. 1	<b>Deadline.</b> By Dec. 1 editors must have filled in the spreadsheet of the anticipated publications for Winter/Fall issue
Jan. 15	<b>Deadline.</b> all 4-6 Reviews must be submitted for Winter/Spring issue by this date
<b>Feb/March</b>	<b>Winter/Spring pdf issue published</b>
May 1	<b>Deadline.</b> By May 1 editors must have filled in the spreadsheet of the anticipated publications for Summer/Fall issue
May 15:	submit any early reviews if available that might go online before Fall issue
July 15	<b>Deadline.</b> all 4-6 Reviews must be submitted for Summer/Fall issue by this date
<b>Aug-Sept</b>	<b>Summer/Fall pdf issue published</b>

**c. Forum editor** should make sure there is at least one essay ready each month. Several essays can be submitted at once to the General Editor/Office, and *Symposium* will assess and hold or release online as appropriate. All forums must be listed in an issue spreadsheet regardless of online release date.

#### WORKING PROCESSES:

##### **Article:**

1. All submissions will be initially assessed by the Component Editor for suitability in the journal. Submissions are then sent to at least two expert referees for assessment. The Editor, who will gather feedback, has final approval on whether a submission is published.
2. The Editor has a right to send submissions directly to referees who complete the Referee Assessment Form (see attached) and if the “grade” is subpar, reject immediately.
3. Referees will
  - a.) complete a brief **Referee Assessment Form** (in Component Editor Google Drive) and
  - b.) if they so choose, make anonymous comments on the manuscript directly through Word tracking or tracking on a google doc, or other means as advised by the Component Editor.
4. On the **Referee Assessment Form** submissions are scored out of 50 points. The editor can assess the referees’ “grades” by adding together their points—80 is B, etc. and gauge whether the grade is high enough for further consideration.
5. When the editor feels the submission is ready, he/she will inform the General Editor who will be able to see the manuscript online and approve it for release it to the office.
6. If a submission is not suitable at all, the Editor responds to the submitter with a brief comment. But the editor is not expected to spend a lengthy amount of time on negative responses.

##### **Reviews:**

Review Editors match acceptable submissions with qualified reviewers.

See Submission webpage

3 Sept. 2018