

Extension Publications & Scholarly Resources Development Guidelines

Extension Scholarship is defined as the creation, integration, transfer, application and dissemination of evidence-based knowledge for the benefit of stakeholders.

Guidelines	Notes
<p>Standard categories for describing publications and scholarly work. The standard (effective July 2022) for Extension Publications will be those that are peer- reviewed.</p> <p>For a publication/product to be considered “peer reviewed”, the author must adhere to the following protocol:</p> <p>A. Define each publication or product as one of the following standard categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Curriculum.</i> Multi-lessons with evaluations to include but not limited to activities, PowerPoint slide decks, multiple fact sheets, workbooks, online programs, facilitator’s guide; This would be similar to an “Extension program” 2. <i>Creative work.</i> This may be an original or an expansion of existing work. If an expansion of existing work, the use of information or approach should be unique; may include traditional media, videos, podcasts, webcast, e-zines (online magazines), mobile apps, virtual experiences, infographics, social media posts, social marketing, displays, demonstrations, interactive teaching tools, educational games, etc. 3. <i>Research publication.</i> Involves cutting edge research (of the specialist or a colleague) but so new that there are no consumer pieces readily available (such as field demonstrations, community based and/or participatory research); May include comprehensive pubs, fact sheets, blog posts, empirical research publications, pilot studies, and trials 4. <i>Summative publication.</i> Aggregation of research-based information from a variety of sources 5. <i>Decision tools.</i> Tools such as apps, spreadsheets, worksheets, or dashboards that help clientele make informed decisions. <p>B. Identify the originality of the content:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>New work/</i> Original idea (Not previously published) 	<p>The term <i>Peer-reviewed</i> aligns with the common language associated with manuscripts prepared for publication in refereed journals. Moreover, this dictates the message that Extension publications are to be viewed as scholarly products created by Extension/Outreach/Engagement experts.</p> <p>This move from the common use of ‘numbered publications’ is not to indicate that numbers will no longer be used to document publications. Hence, the importance of having a number to distinguish publications that may be a part of a series or are similar in nature. There remains a need for cataloging in this way, as a means to quickly reference and/or cite publications accurately. Publications, whether produced by Ag Communications or a department may continue using a consistent numbered format.</p>

Guidelines	Notes
<p>2. <i>Major revision</i> (Major changes to content, format, etc. of an established publication)</p> <p>C. Designate primary delivery method:</p> <p>1. Delivery methods to consider for type of content, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Peer-reviewed Extension Publications (Hard Copy/Print) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Multiple page format ii. Single page front and back format b. Departmental pubs/updates (Hard Copy/Print) c. Decision aids and tools (Web based or spreadsheet) d. Videos <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Instructional ii. User-generated e. Podcasts f. Electronic Media/Websites g. Mobile Applications h. Social Media posts of content or programs i. Newsletters j. PowerPoint Presentations k. Posters/Infographics l. Curriculum/Workbooks (Series) <p>D. Determine (by author) whether the scholarly product is sent to Ag Communications for formatting and distribution or if it is a Departmental scholarly product; Publication/product draft is submitted to Departmental designee who will facilitate the peer-review process (the designee could be the Department Chair, Extension Coordinator, etc.)</p> <p>E. Initiate Peer-Review Process (this process would be facilitated by the Departmental designee)</p>	<p>NOTES:</p> <p>Authors have the freedom to determine if a document is peer reviewed; they should also have the option to get out material that is requiring a 'quick response', then submit for peer review later.</p> <p>As for social media/video review, authors should consider consultation from Ag Comm.</p> <p>Authors can recommend a list of reviewers and the Dept. Publications Designee (DPD) can pick from that list to review the product.</p> <p>Videos and other media products should be 'reviewed' in the form of a transcript/script to more adequately focus on the content.</p> <p>Having a product peer reviewed is an <u>option</u>. If authors choose not to have a product peer reviewed, they can still note the significance/usefulness of a product (among peers, clientele, etc.) in their dossier at the time of performance evaluation.</p>

Guidelines	Notes
<p>Implement UK CES Peer-Reviewed Publication process; The minimum required steps for this process are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Departmental Publications Designee (DPD) ensures that drafts meet the basic criteria (affirm the type of publication/standard categories, originality, delivery method, etc.); In many departments, the Extension Coordinator may be the designee to manage the peer review process; The Department Chair or Unit Director is responsible for making sure the recommended peer review process is in place. 2. Identify reviewers for the process; Two reviewers are required with at least one reviewer being from outside the department/unit (an outside reviewer could be an individual within the Extension organization, within the College or university or beyond); Reviewers are determined by Dept Chair, Designee or a pool of potential reviewers can be identified by the department in general 3. Authors are not to handle their review process but can suggest reviewers. If the designated person to handle the review process is the lead author of a publication, then the Department Chair or Unit Director will designate another person to handle the peer-review process. 4. A Department or Unit can institute a more stringent peer-review process, (For example: Blind or double-blind review, more than two reviewers, etc.). The Departmental designee will ensure in an <i>open</i> review that reviewers' names and affiliations are included on the scholarly product. If a blind review is used, the Departmental designee will record and keep a record of the reviewers for the scholarly pub/work. 5. If deemed a publication that will be processed by Ag Communications, the department designee will submit a draft to Ag Communications for design, editing and printing/posting online. If designated as a departmental publication, the designee will develop the publication through the department's design/editing/posting process (but still following the marketing and branding guidelines defined by the College). In either case, if given advance notice, Ag Communications can offer designing, editing, proof-reading and templates. 6. If Ag Communications is producing the publication, they are to inform the department/specialist when draft is ready and will be published (in print, online, etc.). 	<p>This expectation is not to demean those products that are not peer reviewed. Those time sensitive topics that need to be addressed quickly should still be considered for peer-review, (although there may be times when this is not practical).</p> <p>Products that are not time sensitive would go through the recommended peer-review process and be distributed through the appropriate distribution channels. This decision would be made by the specialist and/or the department's publication designee</p> <p>At least one specialist/faculty member should serve as the contact on each publication submission (some pubs are written by graduate students/post docs who leave often before the pub is released).</p> <p>In the case where revisions are due, the author(s) must either implement comments made by reviewers, or provide an appropriate response/rebuttal to the reviewer comments. The departmental designee may serve as "editor" to judge whether authors properly responded to the review.</p>