The Publication of *Odyssey*: Retrospective and Analysis

An Honors Thesis (ID 499)

By

Laura J. Wirthlin

Thesis Director

[Signature]

Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana
May 1982
I.
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this work is two-fold: First, it is a record of every stage of production of the first Ball State University Honors College journal, *Odyssey*. It is a document of the thought and labor of a group of persons over a substantial portion of a year and is, in this way, a small piece of history. Second, it is a guide for those who seek to do this again and, more importantly, for those who seek to do it better.

In order to achieve this purpose, I have included in each section a history in narrative and documents of the individual stage of production as it actually occurred, an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the procedure used, and suggestions for changing this procedure in order to emphasize and increase the strengths while avoiding and reducing the weaknesses. In several cases, the material contained in these sections overlaps. I have attempted to minimize this overlap in my discussion and to note it when it does occur.

I would not have completed my responsibilities if I had not insured that those who come after me will be able to continue this undertaking. Ideally, this foundation for the future should have been, and henceforth should be, carefully integrated into each stage of the process. As in the first attempt at any venture, however, mistakes were made. For my shortcomings in the journey, this work is meant to stand...
II.
ORGANIZING THE EDITORIAL BOARD

The original editorial board of the then unnamed Honors College journal first met in October, 1981. It included Susan Mouzon, who first suggested the idea of the journal the previous spring; Nancy Aversa and myself, to whom Susan suggested it; Scott Wagner, who became interested as a result of being present at a discussion of the project between Dr. Warren Vander Hill, Director of the Honors College and myself; and Louis Meiman, Jennifer Miller, and Linda Ortenzo, who became interested in the venture through conversations with Nancy, Susan, and myself. At the time the project was approved in spring, 1981, Dr. Vander Hill asked Dr. Richard Wires to become the journal's Faculty Advisor because of his extensive experience with the Honors College and with the production of scholarly publications. When Dr. Thom Tammaro became Assistant Director of the Honors College for the 1981-1982 academic year, he was asked to be the Honors College Advisor to the journal because of his experience with the production of creative publications.

The group met again in November, with the exception of Scott Wagner, who was no longer able to serve on the board, and Dr. Tammaro, who had a conflicting meeting. Announcements concerning the journal which appeared in the Spring and Autumn Quarter issues of the Honors College newsletter, News and Notes, (Appendix K) included requests that persons interested in serving on the editorial board contact me, but as yet, no additional students had
responded. Such a request was also included in a memo providing information about the journal to Honors faculty members and Departmental Honors Representatives (Appendix L), but this had yet to elicit response, either.

After this meeting, Dr. Wires suggested for the board several students with whose work he was familiar. Susan Mouzon also suggested several students having knowledge of art, an area in which we were lacking skilled evaluators. In addition, I designed an application for potential board members (Appendix A) and sent another memo to Honors faculty and Departmental Honors Representatives (Appendix M) asking them to inform their Honors students of this opportunity to apply as well as asking them to recommend students. The application was intended to give students not recommended by faculty, but with the desire to work on the journal, an equal chance to become part of the board by providing evidence of qualifications unknown to their professors or to current board members.

Between the beginning of Winter Quarter and the holiday recess, Susan's efforts had yielded three additional board members: Beth Bone, Tom Harrison, and Paula Tully. My efforts had enlisted by this time Jerry Hall, Mike Kendrick, Dawn Lynch, Mark R. (Randy) Spencer, and Randy Studt. Also, Shannon Mitchell contacted me as a result of the second memo. This brought the total number of board members to fifteen, a number considered by the nuclear board and advisors to be large enough to accommodate multiple evaluations
for board membership. The nuclear board did not choose a specific goal because it was difficult to predict the ideal board size at such an early stage in the endeavor.

Shortly before the January 7 meeting, however, Susan Mouzon recruited Tom Kuhn for the board, and Mike Kendrick and Paula Tully recruited Lisa Symula. This occurred because, in both cases, the individuals involved believed that the board still needed additional members. This brought the total to seventeen (Appendix B), a rather unusual number of persons for such a body, but not one which would create any major problems.

The advisors and nuclear board had agreed that there should be only one editor, but that two or three persons should be chosen as associate editors. I became editor largely by the assumption of the rest of the board. Dr. Wires suggested that there be three associate editors and that for the first year, one each represent the freshman, sophomore, and junior classes. Susan Mouzon, the originator of the idea of an Honors College journal and a chief contributor in the organizational process, was an obvious selection for the sophomore's position. Jennifer Miller was an obvious selection for the freshman's position because she also had been a chief contributor to the journal's organization and had extensive experience with high school publications. In addition, she was the only freshman on the nuclear board, and thus had more knowledge about this particular journal than did a substantial number of the other board members. The third associate editor was chosen at the January 7 meeting. Randy Spencer, a junior who had been previously recommended for the position by Dr. Wires, expressed great interest in
becoming an associate editor and was chosen by consensus. One
should note, however, that these positions were filled by a fresh-
man, sophomore, and junior not out of strict adherence to the
suggested distribution, but because each was an outstanding candi-
date and was not surpassed by any candidate from another class.

In recruiting board members, neither the News and Notes
announcements nor the memos to faculty produced significant measur-
able results. I do believe, however, that both are necessary in
order to reach as many possible persons through as many possible
channels. The newsletter is needed to reach students who are not
currently enrolled in an Honors class or whose work is not yet
known or immediately recalled by those faculty who take an active
interest in the publication. The memos are needed to reach stu-
dents who did not notice the announcement in News and Notes or who,
for some reason, did not receive their newsletters. It is my hope
that the intrinsic publicity of the first edition of the journal
will produce results of its own as well as increasing the results
of these two efforts.

The application forms had no greater success than the announce-
ments and memos. Nevertheless, I believe that these, too, are
necessary. I designed the questions to obtain information concern-
ing a student's desire and abilities to serve on the editorial
board and to provide a preliminary indication of which board members
would be available for various post-evaluation stages of production.
The importance of both aspects has been confirmed by my experiences
in producing the first issue. There was a wide variance in the
usefulness of the evaluations completed by board members. I think
that a serious commitment to quality and/or previous experience which demonstrates this will be discernable in a carefully completed application. Also, willingness to work on many stages of production, particularly the less-than-glamorous ones, has made the services of some board members indispensable. To select a board using these considerations, I believe, would significantly increase the facility with which the journal is produced and could not help but have a positive effect on the finished product.

In September of each year, the editor of the journal should send a letter to each member of the previous year's board, informing the board member when production of the new issue will begin and inviting him or her to reapply for the board. For the second edition of the journal, this may be explained as a formality to demonstrate fairness in the selection of the board. In fact, it serves two other purposes as well. The first is to avoid guaranteeing a board position to a past member who had little commitment to the project at the expense of other students who show great desire to participate in the board's functioning. The second, and similar, purpose is to allow those past board members who do not have the time or the desire to serve on the board again to remove themselves from the board by simply not completing their applications rather than to remain on the board only because of a sense of obligation.

It is particularly important that applications adapted to provide an indication of writing ability be used in the selection of the editor and associate editors (Appendix C). Also, a business manager, necessary to relieve the editor of bookkeeping chores,
should be selected by application. Of primary importance is the selection of the editor. It is essential that a precedent of automatic succession to the post of editor not be established. Such a precedent would discourage others from devoting serious effort to the journal in the hope of eventually becoming editor as well as occasionally resulting in an editor who no longer had time nor interest enough to produce a quality journal. This is also true in selecting the associate editors and the business manager.

The procedure which I suggest for the selection is that the editor be selected in the spring after the galleys have been returned to the printer and that the associate editors and business manager be selected as the board forms in autumn. This timing may encourage prospective editors to participate in the process of proofreading, for which it is otherwise difficult to find volunteers. It will also provide continuity over the summer and allow the new editor to participate in the selection of those with whom he or she must work as well as making it possible for freshmen to apply for these positions.

Candidates for editor should be interviewed by a committee (Appendix D) in order to determine who will best be able to carry out the duties of the position. The committee should consist of the Director of the Honors College (ex officio by his request) and the journal's advisor(s), with whom the editor must work; the outgoing editor, who best knows the demands of the position; and two or three interested board members who will not be applying for the positions of associate editor or business manager, representing the board which the editor must lead. Candidates for associate editor
and business manager may best be selected by a committee consisting of the new editor, the Director of the Honors College (once again \textit{ex officio}), and the journal's advisor(s). In this committee, the editor's decision is preeminent because it is almost solely the editor with whom these persons must work. A committee is useful, however, in order to avoid dissension within the board as a result of resentment of the editor by unsuccessful candidates.

It is advantageous, but not essential, for continuity and growth that the editor be a senior because a guaranteed annual turnover will encourage board members to participate in the decision-making process more than will the likelihood that the same individual will remain the primary decision-maker year after year (which tends to foster complacency and stagnation). Similarly, although it is not necessary that the associate editors represent each of the freshman, sophomore, and junior classes, no more than one associate editor should be a senior. Care should be taken in each case to consider the implications of the decision for the future distribution of the board.

The associate editors and business manager can then assist the new editor in the final evaluation of applicants for board positions. If ten such board members are selected, the total membership of the board will be fifteen. Although more than ten qualified applicants may apply, fifteen is definitely an adequate number to complete the board's functions, while a larger size becomes unwieldy. To limit board membership to a convenient number such as this will have the effect of increasing competition for board positions and thus make it possible to increase the quality of the board.
APPLICATION FOR 1981-82 EDITORIAL BOARD OF ODYSSEY

Name: ___________________________ Class: __________________
Local Address: ______________________ Phone: _____________
Major(s): __________________________ Minor(s): _____________

1. On what aspects of a scholarly/creative journal are you most interested in/capable of working? Explain.

2. What experiences (work, classes, extra-curricular activities, hobbies, etc.) have you had which would make you a capable member of the editorial board of a scholarly/creative journal? Explain.

3. List three references who could evaluate your abilities in these areas (no letters, please).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applications due: 4:30 December 16
WB 207
APPLICATION FOR EDITOR(1), ASSOCIATE EDITORS(2), BUSINESS MANAGER(1)
(complete only if applying for an editorial board office)

1. For what position are you applying? If applying for more than one, list in order of preference.

2. List previous experience particularly applicable to this position. Consider each position separately if necessary.

Applications due: 4:30 December 16
WB 207
### Appendix B

**EDITORIAL BOARD 1981-1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Areas of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura J. Wirthlin</td>
<td>285-5150</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, art, essay, non-scientific academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark R. Spencer</td>
<td>288-3831</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, essay, economics, philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Mouzon</td>
<td>285-4980</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, art, architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Miller</td>
<td>285-5201</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, essay, literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Aversa</td>
<td>285-7854</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, essay, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Bone</td>
<td>285-4980</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, art, architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Hall</td>
<td>285-4983</td>
<td>Poetry, essay, history, literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Harrison</td>
<td>285-4612</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, art, essay, architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Kendrick</td>
<td>285-4986</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, essay, history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kuhn</td>
<td>285-4755</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Lynch</td>
<td>285-5795</td>
<td>Fiction, photo, essay, computer science, business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Meiman</td>
<td>285-4759</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Mitchell</td>
<td>285-7462</td>
<td>Fiction, photo, essay, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Ortenzo</td>
<td>285-5202</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, photo, essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Studt</td>
<td>285-5507</td>
<td>Fiction, essay, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Symula</td>
<td>285-5008</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, essay, philosophy, history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Tully</td>
<td>285-4981</td>
<td>Fiction, poetry, art, essay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*editors
March 29, 1982

Dear

As the production of the first edition of Odyssey draws to a close, I would like to thank you once again for your time and effort. Also at this time, it is necessary to select an editor for the 1983 edition.

In order that a selection committee not overlook anyone who may wish to be considered for the position, I am enclosing an application form with this letter. The selection will not, of course, be based solely upon this application; rather, the form is to alert us to the interest and qualifications of those who apply. If you wish to be considered for the position of editor, please complete this form and return it to the Honors College by 4:30 p.m. April 7.

Selection of associate editors and business manager will be made in September. If you wish to apply for one of these positions, but not that of editor, you may submit the form now, being certain to specify the position in which you are interested, and the new editor will contact you at the beginning of Autumn Quarter. If you wish to apply for one of these positions in the event that you are not selected to be editor, please submit a new application after the 1983 editor is selected.

If you have any further questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Laura J. Wirthlin
1982 Odyssey editor
Application for 1982-83 Editor of Odyssey

Name:_________________________________________ Class:_________

Local Address:_________________________________ Phone:_________

Major(s):____________________________________ Minor(s):_______

Please answer questions one and two in essay form.

1. On what aspects of Odyssey are you most interested in/ capable of working? Explain, using additional pages if necessary.

2. What experiences (work, classes, extra-curricular activities, hobbies, etc.) have you had which would make you a capable editor of Odyssey? Explain, using additional pages if necessary.

3. List three references who could evaluate your abilities in these areas (no letters, please).

Reference Relationship
1) 
2) 
3) 

Applications due: 4:30 April 7
WB 207
SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is your conception of this journal?
2. What aspects of the last issue would you retain?
3. What aspects would you improve? How?
4. What is your conception of the position of editor?
   Associate editor? Business Manager?
5. What would be your priorities as (editor/associate editor/business manager)?
   What would be your priorities in organizing an editorial board? In making selections? In designing layout? In editing?
6. How do you intend to delegate responsibility?
7. What do you have a right to expect from associate editors?
   A business manager? The board? (adjust as needed)
8. Why do you want to be (editor/associate editor/business manager)?
   Why do you think you would be a good (editor/associate editor/business manager)?
   Why do you think you would be the best?
9. What would you expect to be your greatest difficulties (professionally/personally)?
10. How large a time commitment would you be able to make?
III.

DEVELOPING SPECIFICATIONS

The development of specifications overlaps, to some extent, the organization of the editorial board. The nuclear board's meetings were, in fact, for this very purpose. For the first edition of the journal, it was necessary to determine specifications both for the journal's format and for the submissions which the board would receive. Because the specifications for the submissions depended in some respects on the specifications for the journal, I shall begin with the latter.

A. Specifications for the Journal

The nuclear board decided to determine basic specifications for the journal, but to leave details such as type style and size, paper stock, and precise color descriptions to the University Publications office, subject to the board's approval. The group examined various journals from the libraries of the advisors in order to establish its preferences in these areas and to determine other specifications.

The advisors explained that pages are printed in groups of eight (signatures) and thus a multiple of eight would be the best number of pages to print and bind. Both also recommended that the journal be perfect bound, which, although slightly more expensive, would look more professional. The board agreed with both of these suggestions. Upon examining a number of publications, the board decided that a minimum of forty-eight pages would be needed for
perfect binding and that the journal might be forty-eight, fifty-six, or sixty-four pages depending on the number of qualified submissions received. The final decision regarding number of pages was left until a later date when more information might be available. Also after examining the journals, the board decided that its choice of size for the Honors College publication was 6" wide x 9" high.

The board also desired a standard professionally-used type face, black ink, and a natural white paper. The cover, the board decided, should be red on off-white, using Ball State University's colors for the first edition, and the stock should have a flat (non-gloss) finish. The cover should include the masthead, which would consist of the name of the journal, "The Honors College," "Ball State University," and the year, and artwork. No volume number would be needed because the journal was to be published annually. University regulations dictate that "Ball State University" appear on the publication. Any artwork would be considered for the cover, although Susan Mouzon pointed out that a line drawing would probably be the best form to reproduce using red ink.

The board's criteria for the journal's title are recorded in the foreword of the 1982 edition along with the reasons for selecting the name Odyssey, which Dr. Wires suggested. This selection, however, was tentative. Suggestions were requested in the Autumn Quarter News and Notes (Appendix K), but the board received no suggestions from outside sources, and so, to the board's pleasure, the name of the journal remained Odyssey.

These decisions were made during the two Autumn Quarter meetings.
Because these meetings were largely brainstorming sessions, the ideas from which these decisions were developed were generated in a somewhat random order and were entwined with ideas concerning submission specifications. One can obtain a general idea of when these decisions were reached through the edited version of the notes which I took at the meetings (Appendix E), but since most ideas were discussed at both meetings, this division should not be considered rigid.

The decisions and preferences were then relayed to the University Publications office during a meeting of the advisors, myself, Mrs. Gertrude Kane, and Mr. Emmett Sponsel, Director and Assistant Director, respectively, of University Publications. This office then prepared complete specifications and solicited bids for the publishing contract. When the contract was awarded, Mrs. Kane supplied me with the name of the printer and a list of the basic specifications appearing in the contract (Appendix F).

B. Specifications for Submissions

The first set of submission guidelines (Appendix G) was merely an organized version of the specifications which the nuclear board suggested during the Autumn Quarter meetings. I attempted to arrange the specifications so that someone planning to make a submission would easily be able to find and understand the guidelines applicable to the work in question. I showed this set of guidelines to Dr. Tammaro in order to obtain his opinion on their clarity and completeness. He suggested that I rewrite the same guidelines in a paragraph which could then be included in the journal on the
inside cover or editorial page. The second set of submission guidelines (Appendix H) is the resulting paragraph.

This paragraph accompanied the first memo and may have been distributed to and used by some students. Also, it eventually was included in the journal at the bottom of the editorial page (one of the journal specifications had been that there would be no printing on the inside covers). This set of guidelines, however, was not the one finally adopted. Dr. Wires suggested that a longer, more specific, set of submission guidelines be devised in order to prevent numerous questions regarding specification details and to promote conformity among submissions which would later simplify the editing process. He provided as a model the guidelines of the Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, of which he is the editor.

These guidelines, primarily designed to establish a uniform manuscript style, were revised to fit the needs of Odyssey. They became the third and final set of Odyssey submission guidelines (Appendix I), which accompanied the second memo and were distributed through the Honors College office. The revisions included adding an introductory paragraph describing Odyssey, a paragraph regarding poetry, a paragraph regarding art, and concluding instructions indicating how the completed work was to be submitted, all gleaned from the previous submission guidelines. Omitted were a paragraph regarding titles, one regarding numbers, and one regarding dates. These were omitted because the matters discussed involved only simple editorial changes and were therefore not of as major significance as the areas retained or added. Other revision involved insertion of remaining material from the previous Odyssey guidelines.
and minor rearrangement and rewording. Finally, a footnote was added to the page concerning documentation in order to accommodate the variety of citations required by the many disciplines from which we might receive submissions.

The specifications for the journal worked remarkably well. They should probably remain the same in the future in order that Odyssey establish certain consistent characteristics by which it can be identified and thus in order that future editions will be associated with those which preceded them. There are, however, two notable exceptions to this rule. The number of pages should vary according to the number of works included, ideally increasing as a result of an increasing number of excellent submissions. Also, the colors of the cover should probably vary in order to make each issue visually distinct while remaining consistent in form. One suggested color scheme is black and white on gray, which would make a cover photograph appear as though it were a mounted print.

Revisions of specifications for submissions are somewhat more complex. Each version of the submission guidelines had merits and drawbacks. The first set of guidelines was extremely simple. Because of its outline form, the essential information was easy to obtain. The second set, in paragraph form, was more likely to be read in classes, thus more likely to attract submissions, but individual specifications were more difficult to discern. The third set, though the most thorough, was also the least likely to be read. The ideal submission guidelines would include the same amount of information, but in a more readable form.
In addition, many matters arose which were not covered adequately in any of the submission guidelines. Certain problems affected all submissions, whether written or art.

1.) Only works by Honors students or Honors alumni within one year of graduation could be submitted (although we did receive one work from a non-Honors College student enrolled in an Honors College class). As the journal progressed, I intentionally began to use the ambiguous designation "Honors" because it would be open to interpretation for the first edition and in the future. If this journal is to be a general undergraduate journal, as some have suggested after the fact, this designation should be removed or clarified. I have attempted to explain my concept of the first edition of *Odyssey* in the foreword.

For the future, both positions have strengths and weaknesses. I will discuss these further in my conclusions. It is my belief, however, that the board must remain a body of Honors students and that the advisors must be Honors faculty in whatever sense in which the designation is to be applied. My suggestions on the clarification of this term will also appear in my conclusions.

2.) The nuclear board originally suggested that submissions be made anonymous before being given to evaluators. This suggestion was discouraged by Dr. Wires and others as unnecessary and was eventually rejected. At the January 7 meeting, however, the full board strongly favored anonymity, and so all submissions for which it was possible to do so were made anonymous.

Such an inconvenience can be avoided in the future by stating in the submission guidelines that one title page listing name,
address, and telephone number accompany all works submitted, but that no author/artist identification appear on the work itself (the only exception would be if the submission were the original copy of a signed art work). Artists wishing to identify works to which a title page could not be removably fastened could list the title of the work or their social security number on the back of the work, submitting this with an unattached title page.

3.) All persons who wish to have their works returned must submit a self-addressed (with sufficient postage if necessary) envelope at the time of submission. Persons who wish to have their works returned, but not mailed, must pick them up at the Honors College office within one week of the notification date.

Other problems affected only written works.

1.) The major problem was consistency in documentation. Most submissions were received with their original form of documentation, although the submission guidelines specified the form given in Turabian's Manual for Writers. To insist upon this style in submissions would undoubtedly decrease the amount of submissions, an undesirable effect; however, the works which appear in Odyssey must conform to one style.

A possible solution is to state that works accepted for Odyssey must have documentation of the specific style, but that the author will have one week after acceptance to provide three copies of correctly revised notes (and manuscript, if necessary). It should be noted, though, that potential difficulty in obtaining revised notes may result in the rejection of one work in favor of another of comparable merit.
Finally, it is probably advisable to retain use of Turabian's *Manual for Writers* as the source of *Odyssey*'s specified style of documentation because a precedent for this style has been established and it is unlikely that any other style is any more readily adaptable to the wide variety of manuscripts which *Odyssey* may receive.

2.) A minor consideration is that all manuscripts should include the title on the first page because the work will be evaluated without the title page attached. It would be acceptable to have the title handwritten on the first page of each copy of a previously typed manuscript.

3.) The title page should include the author's name as he or she wishes it to appear in *Odyssey* if the work is accepted.

4.) Outlines, Tables of Contents, etc. are unnecessary and should be removed prior to submission.

5.) Three copies must be submitted in order to insure complete evaluation.

Still other problems affected only art works.

1.) In order to be printed in the journal, all accepted art works must be transformed into 5" x 7" black and white (color art work was not listed in the contract) prints by Ball State's Photo Service at a charge (in 1982) of $2.50 per work. This process also causes a time delay and an inconvenience of contacting artists in order for them to approve the print quality. More importantly, some works needed special reproduction techniques and had to be redone.

A possible solution is to state that photographs should be submitted in the form of 5" x 7" unmounted prints whenever possible.
For other art works, any special reproduction techniques needed should be specified at the time of submission.

2.) One photographer mentioned that when his submissions were returned, one had a few scratches on it. He said that he had no evidence that this was done while Odyssey had the photograph, but that he wanted to alert us to the possibility that damage could occur.

All art works should be submitted in a manner in which they will be protected from damage. All works will be handled with utmost care, but neither Odyssey nor the Honors College will be responsible for damage claims.

The set of revised guidelines (Appendix J) is an attempt to solve as many of these problems as possible.
NOTES: FIRST MEETING

Cover:
Standard masthead--Odyssey
Honors College
Ball State University
Year

Off-white and red
Line Drawing
No printing on inside

Copies: 1000

Pages: Black ink on white paper

Art: suggest high contrast

Text: pages fastened

Size: 48, 56, or 64 pages

NOTES: SECOND MEETING

Submission Guidelines:
Deadline January 15
Selections announced February 15
Maximum words--4500
Three copies
Anything suitable for publication, any field
Photographs or slides of some art media
Maximum of six poems by one author
Maximum of six art works by one artist
Double-space
Notes at end
One graduate piece?
Obtain guidelines at WB 207

Specifications:
6" x 9"
Perfect bound
64 page?

Publicity:
Contact honors professors, Departmental Honors Reps
Posters

Appendix E
BASIC SPECIFICATIONS FOR ODYSSEY

6" x 9"
48 pages plus cover
Perfect Bound

Ink
  Text: black
  Cover: red

Paper: Sundance Natural White
Type: Caledonia
To include:
  Prose
  Poetry
  Halftones
  Line Drawings

Number of copies: 1000 (later raised to 1200)

Printer: Printer Zink
  State Road 9 South
  Alexandria, IN 46001
  (317) 724-4451
SUBMISSION GUIDELINES FOR ODYSSEY

All Entries:
1. Entries may be made by current Honors students or Honors students within one year of graduation.
2. Any scholarly or creative work suitable for publication in its field is eligible for submission.
3. The entry deadline is January 15, 1982.

Written Entries:
1. Three copies of each entry must be submitted.
2. Entries must be typed double-spaced on 8½" x 11" white paper. Each page must be numbered. Notes must be placed at the end.
3. No entry may exceed 4500 words.
4. A maximum of six poems by one author may be submitted.

Art Entries:
1. Art entries must be mounted or affixed to 8½" x 11" white paper. The artist's name must be on the back of each work and, where applicable, on the paper.
2. Entries of media which cannot be mounted or so affixed should be photographed and the photograph submitted according to item 1.
3. A maximum of six works by one artist may be submitted.
SUBMISSION GUIDELINES FOR ODYSSEY

Odyssey is a publication of the Ball State University Honors College consisting of works by Honors College students and Honors College alumni within one year of graduation. Scholarly or creative work in any discipline which is suitable for publication is eligible for consideration. Submissions must be typed double-spaced on 8½" x 11" white paper, one side only, with notes, where applicable, at the end. No entry may exceed 4500 words. A maximum of six poems by one author may be submitted. Drawings or photographs smaller than 9" x 12" may be submitted in original form, but for other art works, slides should be submitted. A maximum of six works by one artist may be submitted. The entrant’s name and address must accompany each work. Only art works will be returned.

All submissions should be sent to:

Odyssey
Honors College, WB 207
attn: Laura Wirthlin
Odyssey is a publication of the Ball State University Honors College consisting of works by Honors College students and Honors College alumni within one year of graduation. Scholarly or creative work in any discipline suitable for publication is eligible for consideration.

Submissions should conform to the following guidelines. In matters not covered below the Manual of Style published by the University of Chicago Press (12th Edition) should be consulted for further guidance. For more ready reference the Turabian Manual for Writers should be used.

Text:

Three copies of the manuscript should be prepared and submitted. One copy of each work accepted for publication will be returned to the author with all editorial changes marked. Unaccepted manuscripts will not be returned.

All manuscripts should be typewritten on 8½" x 11" bond paper, one side only, with all copy double-spaced. No submission may exceed 3500 words.

Punctuation should generally incorporate conservative patterns. A comma should be used in a sequence before "and" (such as "leaders, followers, and the public") and commas should be used to separate subordinate clauses. Do not use commas after short phrases at the start of sentences (such as "In 1944, the President" or "After the war, the government") but commas should be used after words being emphasized (such as "Finally, the cabinet" or "Thirdly, ").

In scholarly works, the highest levels of formal usage should be used. Do not use any abbreviations or contractions in the text of the manuscript. Underline all foreign words and terms. Avoid the use of slang expressions and jargon. Any long quotation that exceeds five lines of typescript should be indented but double-spaced. Notes should be arranged according to the guidelines on the following page.

A maximum of six poems by one author may be submitted. Each poem should be placed on a separate sheet (or sheets) of paper.

Drawings or photographs 9" x 12" or smaller may be submitted in original form, but for other art works, slides should be submitted. A maximum of six works by one artist may be submitted. All art works will be returned.

The entrant's name and address must accompany each work submitted.

All submissions should be sent to:

ODYSSEY
Attn: Laura Wirthlin
Honors College WB 207
BSU
Notes:

Notes, where applicable, should be typed (double-spaced) on separate sheets. Center the word "Notes" (not "Footnotes") at the top of the first page. Number notes consecutively from the beginning to the end of the text.

Accuracy and completeness of notes are the responsibility of the author. Be certain to include all the essential information in each citation: author's full name; entire title of book (or article); complete publishing data (city, firm, and year for books; journal, volume, and date for articles); exact page (and volume if needed). Other data should be included in the citation whenever appropriate: name of editor, name of translator, title of series, number of edition. This information should be arranged according to the examples below and the forms cited in the previously mentioned manuals.* Second and later citations should not repeat the full data.

Reference numbers should be elevated a half-line in the text (such as "authority") but in the citation a regularly aligned number and period should be used (such as "2. See the following: "). Indent each note as a separate paragraph.

Abbreviations that are customary should be used in the notes: p., pp., ibid., vol., ed., trans., Co., Inc.

In second and later citations do not use op. cit. or loc. cit. Use the author's name and a shortened title instead.

The following notes may serve as illustrative examples (but notes should be double-spaced in manuscripts):


3. Ibid., pp. 119-120.


6. Henderson was British ambassador to Berlin on the eve of the war. His actions in respect to appeasement of Hitler have earned him much criticism.


9. Ibid.


*If the nature of an article is such that it is impossible for its notes to conform to this style, the nearest possible approximation should be used.
ODYSSEY SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Odyssey is a publication of the Ball State University Honors College consisting of works by Honors students and Honors alumni within one year of graduation. Scholarly or creative work in any discipline suitable for publication is eligible for consideration.

Submissions should conform to the following guidelines. In matters not covered below the Manual of Style published by the University of Chicago Press (12th Edition) should be consulted for further guidance. For more ready reference the Turabian Manual for Writers should be used.

All Submissions:

Return Policy: All works to be returned must be accompanied at the time of submission by a self-addressed envelope bearing any necessary postage. Persons who wish their works returned, but not mailed, must include on the envelope the words "Do Not Mail" and must pick up the envelope at the Honors College office within one week of the notification date.

Title Page: Each submission must be accompanied by one 8½" x 11" title page which includes the title of the work, the author's or artist's name as it is to appear in the journal if the submission is accepted, and the author's or artist's local address and telephone number. No identification other than the title of the work should appear on the submission itself (except in the case of the original copy of a signed art work).

Manuscripts:

Form: Three copies of the manuscript must be submitted. Each copy must include the title. One copy of each work accepted for publication will be returned to the author with all editorial changes marked.

Manuscripts must be typed double-spaced on 8½" x 11" bond paper with notes, where applicable at the end. Each poem must be typed on a separate sheet of paper. No work may exceed 4000 words. A maximum of six poems by one author may be submitted.
Style: In scholarly works, the highest levels of formal usage should be used. Do not use any abbreviations or contractions in the text of the manuscript. Underline all foreign words and terms. Avoid the use of slang expressions and jargon. Any long quotation that exceeds five lines of typescript should be indented.

Documentation: Works may be submitted with any form of documentation, but for publication, notes must conform to the guidelines on the following page. The author of an accepted work will be given one week after the notification date to provide three copies of correctly revised notes (and manuscripts, if necessary). A member of the editorial board will be available to assist the author with any difficulties encountered in this process.

Art:

Form: Art works should be submitted in the form of 5" x 7" unmounted photographs wherever possible. For other forms, any special techniques needed to reproduce this work by photograph should be noted on the title page. Art works should be submitted in a manner in which they will be protected from damage. All works will be handled with utmost care, but neither Odyssey nor the Honors College will be responsible for damage claims. A maximum of six works by one artist may be submitted.

Identification: The title of the work should appear on the back of the submissions. Untitled works should include the artist's social security number instead.
Notes:

Notes, where applicable, should be typed (double-spaced) on separate sheets. Center the word "Notes" (not "Footnotes") at the top of the first page. Number notes consecutively from the beginning to the end of the text.

Accuracy and completeness of notes are the responsibility of the author. Be certain to include all the essential information in each citation: author's full name; entire title of book (or article); complete publishing data (city, firm, and year for books; journal, volume, and date for articles); exact page (and volume if needed). Other data should be included in the citation whenever appropriate: name of editor, name of translator, title of series, number of edition. This information should be arranged according to the examples below and the forms cited in the previously mentioned manuals.* Second and later citations should not repeat the full data.

Reference numbers should be elevated a half-line in the text (such as "authority") but in the citation a regularly aligned number and period should be used (such as "2. See the following:"). Indent each note as a separate paragraph.

Abbreviations that are customary should be used in the notes: p., pp., ibid., vol., ed., trans., Co., Inc.

In second and later citations do not use op. cit. or loc. cit. Use the author's name and a shortened title instead.

The following notes may serve as illustrative examples (but notes should be double-spaced in manuscripts):


3. Ibid., pp. 119-120.


6. Henderson was British ambassador to Berlin on the eve of the war. His actions in respect to appeasement of Hitler have earned him much criticism.


9. Ibid.


* If the nature of an article is such that it is impossible for its notes to conform to this style, the nearest possible approximation should be used.
IV.

OBTAINING SUBMISSIONS

To obtain submissions, the nuclear board decided to employ a multi-faceted campaign. Announcements were included in the Autumn and Winter Quarter issues of *News and Notes* (Appendix K). Memos were sent to all Honors faculty and Departmental Honors Representatives requesting that they inform students of this opportunity for publication and to suggest to students that specific outstanding works be submitted. One memo was sent before Autumn Quarter break (Appendix L) and one before the holiday recess (Appendix M) in order to give students the opportunity to search for previous works or to create new ones while on vacation. Posters announcing *Odyssey* and soliciting submissions were ordered from Display Service (Appendix N) and posted at various campus locations. The locations were selected to reach as many possible Honors students and included the Honors College display case, Botsford/Swinford and Schmidt/Wilson Halls, Carmichael Hall, the Architecture Building, and the Student Center. In addition, each board member attempted to obtain submissions through individual contact with Honors students.

By January 6, 1982, I had received many promises of submissions, but had in my possession only a handful. At the January 7 meeting, I reiterated to the board the necessity of each of them personally soliciting submissions. In the week before the deadline, submissions poured in. Based on the distribution of authors and artists, it appears that this occurrence was a result both of personal contact
by board members and of general procrastination by students who had planned to make submissions. At the meeting during which selections were to be made, which I will describe in greater detail in section six, the board agreed that among these submissions there were not enough excellent manuscripts to complete the journal. The board decided to accept additional manuscripts, excluding poetry, until 10:00 p.m. the following Sunday. This effort yielded nine additional submissions.

Several members of the board were disappointed in the total number of submissions, but all agreed that for the first edition of a publication, the results were good. As with the organization of the editorial board, I expect that the intrinsic publicity of the first issue of *Odyssey* will increase the results of the methods used to obtain submissions. Specifically, I believe that students impressed by the 1982 edition will be more likely to read *News and Notes* articles about the journal and that professors likewise impressed will be more likely to present thoroughly the material in the memos, rather than giving the notices only cursory attention as many did this year. I suggest, however, that an announcement be made in the Honors session during Orientation and that the first memo be sent in mid-Autumn Quarter, earlier than was possible this year. Also, I suggest that posters be placed in additional locations such as Elliott Hall, the Administration Building, and other academic buildings. Finally, personal contact is indispensable. A way to increase its use is to have members of the editorial board visit Honors classes during Autumn and Winter Quarters in order to provide information and to encourage submissions. Also, faculty
members who take an active interest in their students submitting works to Odyssey must not be taken for granted.
NEWS AND NOTES ANNOUNCEMENTS

Spring, 1981 (in "Announcements")
There is a possibility that the Honors College could publish a LITERARY JOURNAL this coming year. If enough interested people submit articles, the project will have a good chance of surviving. Contributions would include original poetry, short stories, short plays, artwork, and possibly photography. The magazine would be a non-paying, non-profit publication printed by and for the Honors College.

To complete this project, the Honors College needs editorial staff and advisors as well as contributors. This would include those interested in the actual production process and those merely willing to act in an advisory capacity sharing their past experience on such publications.

Any interested persons should contact Dr. Vander Hill or Laura Wirthlin (Botsford Hall 5150)

Fall, 1981 (in "Announcements")
HONORS JOURNAL
This year, the Honors College will begin publication of a scholarly/creative journal. The Honors College Advisor will be Dr. Thom Tammaro and the Faculty Advisor will be Dr. Richard Wires. Persons wishing to work on the staff of this journal should contact Laura
Wirthlin (Ph. 5151) or the Honors office. Guidelines for submissions may be obtained at the office and through Departmental Honors Representatives as soon as they become available. Suggestions for a title for this journal would be welcome. They should be submitted to the Honors College office, attn. Laura Wirthlin.

Winter, 1981-82 (in "Attention")

HONORS COLLEGE JOURNAL

This spring, the Honors College will be publishing its FIRST SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE JOURNAL. The journal, which has been named Odyssey, will consist of work submitted by Honors College students.

Material may be submitted by anyone in the Honors College and may be work done in or out of class. FICTION, POETRY, ESSAYS, RESEARCH PAPERS, PHOTOGRAPHY, AND ARTWORK may be submitted.

Anyone interested may pick up the guidelines for submission from the Honors College office (WB 207). If you have questions, contact student editor, Laura Wirthlin, phone 5150, Dr. Vander Hill, or Dr. Thom Tammaro, office CA 122, phone 7976.
To: All Honors faculty and Departmental Honors Representatives  
From: The Editorial Board of Odyssey  
Re: Submission Guidelines

Enclosed are the submission guidelines for the new Honors College scholarly/creative journal, which has been tentatively titled Odyssey. Please remind your Honors students now and throughout the year of this opportunity to submit their work for publication. The submission deadline for this year's issue is January 15, 1982, but works may be kept on file for the 1983 edition.

In addition, we would appreciate your suggestions of student work and of students who should be considered for positions on the editorial board.

Anyone with additional questions should contact Dr. Thom Tammaro, Honors College Advisor, or Laura Wirthlin, editorial board.
To: All Honors faculty and Departmental Honors Representatives  
From: The Editorial Board of Odyssey  
Re: Odyssey submissions and Editorial Board positions

Hopefully you received last quarter a copy of the submission guidelines for Odyssey, the new scholarly/creative journal of the Honors College, and informed your Honors students of this opportunity for publication. Please continue to remind them of this and suggest in your comments on outstanding papers or projects that they be submitted to Odyssey. Any scholarly or creative work suitable for publication is eligible, but it must be submitted by January 15, 1982. Additional copies of guidelines are available at the Honors College office (WB 207).

Also, applications for the editorial board are available in the Honors College office (due December 16). Please encourage your students to apply.
ORDERING POSTERS

Posters are obtained by supplying the needed poster-board, accompanied by a completed "Request for Art Work from Displays and Exhibits" form (see following page) to the Display Service office. The forms can be obtained there if the Honors College does not have any on file. Furthermore, if the same poster format is to be used, providing Display Service with a copy of the previous year's poster will facilitate the process.
REQUEST FOR ART WORK FROM DISPLAYS AND EXHIBITS

Type or print and submit to:
Terry Schull, Display Service,
1500 North McKinley

Date request submitted ____________________________
Date Material desired ____________________________
Date request received ____________________________

Note: 4 working days notice is required for single item request. Larger orders require additional production time. Your department will be required to provide posterboard for orders of more than 4 items as well as any other materials not normally stocked by Display Services.

General description of work desired (posters, displays, etc.) ____________________________________________________________________________________________

Number requested (maximum of 4 hand lettered posters) ____________________________________________________________________________________________

Size: height by width (will be approximated unless specified "exact") ____________________________________________________________________________________________

Colors desired if available ____________________________________________________________________________________________

Copy: (underline material to be emphasized)

WILLIAM
The Honors College
Scholarly/Creative
Journal

NOW ACCEPTING
Submissions
of articles, essays, prose, poetry, drawing, photography, ...

Deadline: January 15, 1982
Guidelines Available:
Honors College, CE 207
For further information contact:
Dr. Thom Janz, 7976, 4659
or
Laura Irthlin, 5150

Additional information or specifications: ____________________________________________________________________________________________

Requested by ____________________________________________________________________________________________
Dr. Warren Vander Hill
Dept. Honors College
Room CE 207

Phone 4650, 4659
Signature of head of department

*Completed by ____________________________ Date ____________________________ Time ____________________________

*Method used for completion

*To be filled in by Display Services only
V.

EVALUATING SUBMISSIONS

The first step in the evaluation process was to prepare a list of submissions (Appendix O). This list was numbered in the approximate order in which the works arrived, and these numbers were used in place of the author's/artist's name to identify the works during evaluation. Then I designed a chart (Appendix R) on which to list evaluators for each of two non-file copies during two evaluation periods. Art works, for which there was only one copy, were to be evaluated in four shorter periods in order that they would be given as many evaluations as manuscripts. This could be indicated on the same chart. At the same time, I adapted for Odyssey a submission evaluation form (Appendix U) used by the Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, an available model which had been tested by use and which consisted of basic questions that seemed appropriate for a publication such as Odyssey.

At the January 7 meeting I outlined the schedule for evaluation and explained the method of evaluation (Appendix P). The submission deadline was January 15. The editor and associate editors would meet the following day to assign submissions and to divide them for the first evaluation period. The board was to pick up evaluation packets, containing submissions and evaluation forms, at the Honors College on Monday, January 18. The board only had one copy of art submissions, so these were due back at the Honors College on January 21, while manuscripts were not due back until January 25. The art would be redistributed on January 22 and returned by the second evaluator at the same time as the manuscripts.
The same pattern would be followed the second week. The editors would meet each time works were returned in order to redivide them and to prepare new evaluation packets.

I outlined the basic method of evaluation listed at the bottom of the production schedule. A few matters had occurred to me after the schedules were printed, however, and so I added them at this meeting. These matters included the necessity of strict confidentiality regarding evaluations, particularly until the accepted works were announced, and the possibility of using excerpts from lengthy submissions. While passing around a sample of the evaluation form, I elaborated on the instructions at the bottom of the schedule and the questions on the evaluation form, providing examples of possible situations.

Before the meeting adjourned, I asked everyone to sign a list indicating name, telephone number, and types of works which they were most interested in and qualified for evaluating. This was then transformed into a list by area of board members who had expressed interest in evaluating a particular subject (Appendix Q). Until January 15, no more was done regarding the actual evaluation of submissions, save photocopying evaluation forms and purchasing two art portfolios in which to distribute the art works to evaluators.

The January 16 meeting of the editors occurred as scheduled. Lasting an hour and a half, it was slightly longer than originally hoped (although not realistically expected), but accomplished its objectives. We decided to have the three architecture majors, who had had the most extensive background in art, evaluate all of the art submissions during the first week of evaluation (they had
previously agreed to this). For the second week, each art submission was assigned to two other evaluators from the "art" list. Next we assigned academic works, as areas of expertise would be significant in determining evaluators. This would leave both poetry and fiction, both of which had many possible evaluators, with which to balance the evaluation loads. In each case, we attempted to assign three of the persons most qualified to evaluate a paper on a given subject and one "layman" who would provide some measure of the paper's general interest. We then assigned poetry, assigning complete sets of an author's poetry to two evaluators and each poem individually to two additional evaluators. This method was designed to provide both comparative rankings among an author's works and individual assessments of each poem. Finally, we assigned fiction and "miscellaneous" (one humorous essay), because we could assign these works to virtually any evaluator in order to obtain balanced evaluation loads. Within this entire process, we had to be extremely careful to avoid assigning any board member to evaluate his or her own works, which was made more difficult because the editor alone knew the identities of the authors. The final result was what we believed to be a relatively balanced distribution (Appendix S).

Several things happened during the two evaluation periods, however, which were not precisely as planned. As a result of extreme weather and the proximity of residences of the board to that of the editor, most board members returned evaluation packets directly to me, and I delivered new packets directly to them. The completed packets arrived whenever convenient for each evaluator. This resulted in a constant process of paper-shuffling by me because it was
hardly necessary to involve an associate editor for any one packet. It also resulted in early completion of the evaluation process.

The evaluations themselves produced many unexpected questions from board members, primarily resulting from confusion about whether a "normal editing" designation implied that a piece was excellent enough for acceptance. As most board members discovered, they really did not have enough background experience to establish absolute standards for works, yet neither did they have enough submissions (or a previous edition of the journal) for comparison. This confusion resulted in a minor modification of this item and of question one on the submission evaluation form. The revised form (Appendix V) was introduced when additional copies of the forms were needed.

The final adjustment was to shuffle the assignments of art works so that the number of evaluators concurrently assigned art submissions would match the number of protective art portfolios. In spite of these difficulties, the process of evaluation was completed in a remarkably short time for the first attempt at such a task, putting production of the journal ahead of schedule.

I encountered three main problems with the evaluation system. The first, which I discovered upon tallying the evaluation assignments (Appendix T), was that the distribution was not nearly so balanced as we had intended. Also, errors in the types of works assigned had occurred (check marks). The second was that by maintaining a constant flow of submissions to and from evaluators, I was confronted with a larger, longer, and less organized amount of
work than I would have been had I strictly adhered to the schedule. Because I began to realize the amount of time after the evaluation needed for completing the details of editing, I accepted this situation in the interest of speeding the evaluation process. The third problem was that the evaluations were not specific enough for the editors to derive relative rankings from them. This created a further problem in the selection process because there was a lack of evidence with which to support an evaluator's recommendation regarding a work to those who had not evaluated it themselves.

I devised a new evaluation system (Appendix X) which I hoped would solve these problems. The method of assigning submissions was mathematical and systematic. With slight adjustments (arrows), the work load was relatively balanced among board members. Submission shuffling by the editor(s) would involve only one copy of each work and would follow a schedule more strictly than before. Using a shorter evaluation period, this method allowed evaluation of each work by the editor, associate editors, and three additional board members. This greater familiarity by the editors with each submission would facilitate recommendations to the board as a whole. While not a perfect system, it was a vast improvement over the first method. To complement this system, I further modified the submission evaluation form (Appendix W) in order to provide a more precise ranking of submissions within each subject area.

I still believe that this submission evaluation form will provide the necessary information without becoming so structured that it is ineffective by forcing over-categorization. Upon further reflection, however, the Submission Evaluation System: Model 1 is
not the method which I recommend for future evaluation periods. The method which I believe would be more effective is a variation of that used in this year's art evaluation and was suggested for general use by Jerry Hall. As described earlier in this section, three board members evaluated all art works during the first week of evaluations, and two additional board members evaluated each work during the second week. The evaluations of the second week were compiled with the recommendations of the group of three to derive a list of the most excellent works. From these, the board accepted the most highly recommended works for the maximum number of full pages which could be allotted for art (fifteen percent of total pages was the limit set by the editors according to standard practice). Two additional works from those recommended were selected to occupy half-pages.

The system which I suggest is that board members have the opportunity to serve on as many such evaluation committees as they wish. The committee structure would reflect the subject divisions of art, poetry, fiction (and miscellaneous, if necessary), and academic works (which may be divided into essay and research categories). Each committee would be chaired by an associate editor or the editor and would develop recommendations for the chairman to present to the entire board.

These recommendations would be based on the evaluations of individual committee members regarding each work. Each committee member would be responsible for examining and evaluating the works in the committee's area. One copy of each work would be available for this purpose at the Honors College and another would be available
in the residence hall through the editor or an associate editor. Art, however, would be available only at the Honors College. The third copy of manuscripts would remain at all times in the Odyssey file at the Honors College and would not be available to board members for evaluation purposes. These evaluations should be recorded on the revised evaluation forms. They would then be used during the committee meetings in the formulation of recommendations, although they should probably first be examined by the chairman in order to determine the consensus, if any, about each work.

Each committee would meet after its members had had the opportunity to evaluate the works in its area. The committee's task would be to determine which works belong in each of the four evaluation categories and to prepare a justification of this disposition. Suggestions on how to accomplish this can be found in section six. The art committee would probably meet first because the number of submissions and the time needed to evaluate them would probably make art the area most conducive to rapid evaluation. The poetry committee could be ready to meet on the day following the art committee's meeting. Fiction and miscellaneous would probably be discussed next because of the limited amount of submissions in this category. Academic works would likely be the category requiring the longest evaluation time and so this committee would be the last to meet.

This evaluation system offers solutions to the three main problems cited earlier. The distribution of evaluation assignments would not necessarily be balanced, but would allow board members to do as much work as they are willing and able to do. As outlined in Model 1, the editor and associate editors should become familiar
with all submissions and thus, including the editors, an adequate number of people to make informed, representative recommendations should be involved in each area. All of the works in each category would be kept as a set, avoiding the problem of shuffling individual submissions. Furthermore, the responsibility for the evaluation process is delegated to the board members, freeing the editor for other necessary functions and encouraging greater student involvement while a more effective evaluation process occurs in a shorter time (Appendix Y). Not only would the evaluations be more specific because of the revised evaluation forms, but they would also be more specific because of the composite recommendations formed by the committee after informed discussion. Those interested in each area would have had the opportunity to become informed and to contribute their opinions to a small body with similar concerns. Those uninterested in or uninformed about an area would yield, for the most part, to the authority of "experts." Although this system may not involve the entire board in the initial stage of forming a recommendation concerning each work, it will concentrate the power in the hands of those who have the most interest in working to insure a quality publication, whether in a single subject area or in the entire spectrum of the production.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>J. Will</td>
<td>DNA: Caution or Catastrophe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>L. Wirthlin</td>
<td>And to the Republic...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>You Can't Get There...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>J. Feltman</td>
<td>The Building of Canterbury Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>N. Meyer</td>
<td>Photo: Carmichael/pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo: Puppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>T. Nemcik</td>
<td>Photo: Two Worlds in Photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>D. Sadler</td>
<td>Photo: Sidelight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo: Open shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo: Urban Studies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo: Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S. Knies</td>
<td>The Significant Other...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>P. Humiston</td>
<td>Rendering: Private Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T. Kuhn</td>
<td>Aberrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>C. Miller</td>
<td>Nast's Creation of the Tammany Tiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M. Burrow</td>
<td>&quot;Even Mr. Peabody...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>B. Meeds</td>
<td>The Hitch-hiker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>J. Hall</td>
<td>Night Visions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poem: untitled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Deluge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conversations with a .45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scenes from a Dream by Freud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>C. Craddock</td>
<td>Black Dove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noctu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>L. Ortenzo</td>
<td>Life after Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>D. Gyure</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>L. Winningham</td>
<td>Whores, Gardens,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>C. Penas</td>
<td>Achilles, Odysseus,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Life of an Air Force Brat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>J. Miller</td>
<td>Time Passing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>S. Mitchell</td>
<td>A Play in Multiple Realities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>J. Jenkins</td>
<td>A Hellish Nightmare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>J. V. Hill</td>
<td>We're not Devo; We are Cubes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Watching the Congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>P. Tully</td>
<td>You Don't Fool Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hidden Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Damn Me Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>L. Stephenson</td>
<td>The Curse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>L. Forthofer</td>
<td>I Love You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>Images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remember Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Who am I?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title/Authors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>(Forthofer) I Listened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>All I Ever Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>S. Mouzon Nightmares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Country Mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>L. Stephenson As I Reach My Destiny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>T. Harrison Rendering: Deanery Garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>A. Bolen Photo: Leaf/manhole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>A. Carras Photo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>T. Harrison Photo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>A. Kirkpatrick Photo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>B. Bone Photo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>B. Clausing Pencil Drawing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>R. Borrelli Rendering Times Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>D. Boys Life Magazine Cover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>N. Booher My Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>K. Klee The Novel Viewpoint of a Novice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>C. Diehl The Piety of Edmond Dantes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Dante's Inferno Revisited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>A Study of the Style...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>L. Wean Phenylketonuria: a Preventable Disaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>M. Kendrick Crisis and Controversy...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>M. Dizer Inside Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1982 ODYSSEY PRODUCTION SCHEDULE, JANUARY 7 - FEBRUARY 15

January
7 Meeting of Editorial Board
15 Submission deadline
16/17 Editor and Associate Editors meet to assign evaluators
18 Editorial Board picks up evaluation packets at Honors College
21 Art and poetry returned to Honors College with evaluations
22 Editorial Board picks up art and poetry packets at Honors College
25 All submissions returned to Honors College with evaluations
26 Editorial Board picks up evaluation packets at Honors College
29 Art and poetry returned to Honors College with evaluations
30 Editorial Board picks up art and poetry packets at Botsford 219

February
2 All submissions returned to Honors College with evaluations
3 Editor and Associate Editors meet to review evaluations
4 Editorial board meets to discuss tentative selections
   Selections needing expert evaluation delivered to consulting evaluators
9 Manuscripts with editorial changes marked returned to Honors College
10-12 Manuscript changes discussed with authors
   Changes marked on copies for University Publications
13-14 Editors meet to discuss layout preferences
15 Selections delivered to University Publications

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

1. Do Not Mark on Manuscripts!

2. On separate page(s), keep list of changes which would need to be made in order to publish manuscript. This includes mistakes in spelling, punctuation, diction, form, etc. Do not worry if you do not catch them all, but be as thorough as possible. Remember, do not mark on manuscripts!

3. Complete Submission Evaluation Form
   a. Consider the submission as an example of it's genre. Its appropriateness for Odyssey is important, but should not form the basis of your evaluation in questions one and two.

   b. Consider the difficulty of changes. Spelling, punctuation, diction, etc. are "normal editing." Rewriting of as much as a paragraph will probably require "revisions by the author." Is the content worth it?
Appendix Q

EVALUATORS BY SUBJECT

Art
Beth Bone
Tom Harrison
Dawn Lynch (photo)
Louis Meiman (photo)
Jenny Miller
Shannon Mitchell (photo)
Susan Mouzon
Linda Ortenzo (photo)
Paula Tully
Laura Wirthlin (photo)

Poetry
Nancy Aversa
Beth Bone
Jerry Hall
Tom Harrison
Mike Kendrick
Tom Kuhn
Louis Meiman
Jenny Miller
Shannon Mitchell
Susan Mouzon
Linda Ortenzo
Randy Spencer
Lisa Symula
Paula Tully
Laura Wirthlin

Essay
Nancy Aversa
Jerry Hall
Mike Kendrick
Tom Kuhn
Dawn Lynch
Jenny Miller
Shannon Mitchell
Linda Ortenzo
Randy Spencer
Randy Studt
Lisa Symula
Paula Tully
Laura Wirthlin

Fiction
Nancy Aversa
Beth Bone
Tom Harrison
Mike Kendrick
Tom Kuhn
Dawn Lynch
Louis Meiman
Jenny Miller
Shannon Mitchell
Susan Mouzon
Linda Ortenzo
Randy Spencer
Randy Studt
Lisa Symula
Paula Tully
Laura Wirthlin

Academic Areas
Nancy Aversa
(general)
Jerry Hall
(history, literature)
Mike Kendrick
(history, humanities)
Dawn Lynch
(computer science, business)
Jenny Miller
(literature, humanities)
Shannon Mitchell
(general)
Randy Spencer
(economics, philosophy)
Randy Studt
(general)
Lisa Symula
(history, philosophy)
Laura Wirthlin
(history, humanities)
## EVALUATION ASSIGNMENTS

### POETRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Writer 1</th>
<th>Writer 2</th>
<th>Writer 3</th>
<th>Writer 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mouzon</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Mouzon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Symula</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wirthlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wirthlin</td>
<td>(Grader)</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Symula</td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>Symula</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Studt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Symula</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mouzon</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FICTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Writer 1</th>
<th>Writer 2</th>
<th>Writer 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Hall ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
<td>Mouzon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hall ✓</td>
<td>Mouzon</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HUMOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Writer 1</th>
<th>Writer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ART

| 06 | Mouzon, Bone, Harrison | Tully | Lynch |
| 07 | | Ortenzo | Mitchell |
| 08 | | Wirthlin | Tully |
| 09 | | Mitchell | Lynch |
| 10 | | Miller | Wirthlin |
| 11 | | Mitchell | Lynch |
| 12 | | Tully | Ortenzo |
| 14 | | | |
| 25 | | Spencer | Miller |
| 56 | | | |
| 57 | | Tully | Mitchell |
| 60 | | | |
| 61 | Lynch | Tully |
| 62 | Wirthlin | Mitchell |
| 59 | | | |
| 63 | | | |
| 64 | | Miller | Wirthlin |
| 65 | | Wirthlin | Tully |
| 66 | | Ortenzo | Miller |
| 67 | | Miller | Wirthlin |
| 68 | | Mitchell | Lynch |

### ACADEMIC

| 01 | Harrison | Wirthlin | Kendrick | Lynch |
| 02 | Spencer | Symula | Kendrick | Kuhn ✓ |
| 04 | Spencer | Mouzon | Kendrick | Symula | Kuhn ✓ |
| 05 | Wirthlin | Kendrick | Symula | Harrison |
| 13 | Meiman | Lynch | Mitchell | Tully ✓ |
| 16 | Kendrick | | Symula | |
| 19 | Miller | Wirthlin | Ortenzo | |
| 28 | Mitchell | Studt | Symula | Lynch |
| 30 | Hall | Mouzon | Meiman | Wirthlin |
| 31 | Wirthlin | Tully ✓ | Aversa | Meiman |
| 32 | Aversa | Studt | Mitchell | Kendrick |
| 38 | Hall | Symula | Spencer | Kendrick |
| 39 | Ortenzo | Studt | Lynch | Miller |
| 40 | Kuhn ✓ | Aversa | Ortenzo | Miller |

Check marks indicate errors in subject assignments
### EVALUATION TALLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Period 1</th>
<th>Period 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long (4)</td>
<td>Short (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirthlin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16/17)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16/12)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouzon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33/6)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7/15)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aversa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7/77)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23/2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14/7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27/9)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11/9)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>1+F</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8/15)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6/9)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>1+F</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8/17)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6/15)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8/5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symula</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15/18)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>1+F</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11/15)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F=Fiction  
A=Autobiographical  
H=Humor  
#=Academic, Poetry, Art
HONORS COLLEGE ODYSSEY

SUBMISSION EVALUATION FORM

Author: ____________________________________________________________

Title of manuscript: ________________________________________________

Evaluator: __________________________________________________________

1. Does the material make a significant contribution to its field in some particular way (content, approach, insight, viewpoint, revision, other)? Is it outstanding?

2. Are there serious weaknesses in the material? Please identify them specifically.

3. Is the material appropriate for Odyssey? If not, please explain.

4. What should be the disposition of the manuscript in your opinion? Please add any comments you wish.

   ___ Acceptable for publication now with normal editing.
   ___ Possibly acceptable after revisions by the author.
   ___ Unacceptable in present form and without extensive reworking.

Return this form* and the typescript or art to Laura J. Wirthlin
Editor, Odyssey
Honors College (WB 207)

* including correction sheet(s) in the case of non-art submissions
HONORS COLLEGE ODYSSEY
SUBMISSION EVALUATION FORM

Author: ____________________________________________________________

Title of manuscript: _______________________________________________

Evaluator: _________________________________________________________

1. Does the material make a significant contribution to its field in some particular way (content, approach, insight, viewpoint, revision, other)? Is it outstanding?

2. Are there serious weaknesses in the material? Please identify them specifically.

3. Is the material appropriate for Odyssey? If not, please explain.

4. What should be the disposition of the manuscript in your opinion? Please add any comments you wish.
   
   ___ Acceptable for publication now with normal editing.
   
   ___ Definitely ____________ Possibly
   
   ___ Possibly acceptable after revisions by the author.
   
   ___ Unacceptable in present form and without extensive reworking.

Return this form* and the typescript or art to Laura J. Wirthlin
Editor, Odyssey
Honors College (WB 207)

* including correction sheet(s) in the case of non-art submissions
HONORS COLLEGE ODYSSEY
SUBMISSION EVALUATION FORM

Submission Number: ________ Evaluator: __________________________

Submission Title: ____________________________________________

1. Would the submission make a significant contribution to Odyssey in some particular way (content, approach, insight, viewpoint, other)? Is it outstanding?

2. Are there serious weaknesses in the submission? Please identify them specifically.

3. Is the material appropriate for Odyssey? If not, explain.

4. Is the submission, in your opinion,
   ___ A first choice. Definitely publishable quality.
       One of the best submissions in this category.
       (If the author has multiple works which you are evaluating, is this the strongest?)
   ___ A second choice. Probably publishable quality, but not as strong as group 1. Include if space permits.
   ___ A third choice. Possibly publishable quality.
       Filler.
   ___ Unacceptable.

Return this form, correction sheet (where applicable), and the submission to: Odyssey Editor
Honors College (WB 207)
SUBMISSION EVALUATION: MODEL 1

DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM:

Copy 1: evaluated by editor

Copy 2: evaluated by associate editors according to the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associate Editor</th>
<th>Period 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>poetry</td>
<td>fiction &amp; misc.</td>
<td>academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>fiction</td>
<td>academic</td>
<td>poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>academic</td>
<td>poetry</td>
<td>fiction &amp; misc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this will result in an imbalance of work each evaluation period, the total workload of each associate editor will be equal. The most convenient ordering of light and heavy evaluation periods can be determined at the editors meeting during which the submissions are assigned to the board. The advantage of this method is that the editors will be able to evaluate each work in relation to the body of submissions in its category.

Art: Since there is only one copy of each art work, it is necessary for the editors to use the period between the termination of the evaluation process and the meeting in which the editorial board will make selections for the purpose of familiarizing themselves with the body of art.

Evaluation:

Using the questions on the Submission Evaluation Form, although not the form itself, the editors should rank the submissions by