placing each in one of the following categories:

1.) A first choice. Definitely publishable quality. One of the best submissions in this category. (If an author has multiple works in this category, the editor should indicate which of these he believes to be the strongest by placing an asterisk in front of its listing.)

2.) A second choice. Probably publishable quality, but not as strong as group 1. Include if space permits.


4.) Unacceptable

Editors should retain notes to justify these decisions as well as completing correction sheets for manuscripts.

Copy 3: evaluated by editorial board on Submission Evaluation Forms during three evaluation periods.

The procedure for division of submissions is described below.

Submission Division:

1. Determine number of points each evaluator should be assigned during each evaluation period.

A. Assign points to each submission:

1 point Art, Poetry (1-2 pages)

2 points Short prose (2-3 pages), Poetry (3-4 pages)

4 points Long prose, Epic poetry
B. Add to determine total number of points for all submissions.

C. Divide this number by the number of board members (excluding editors) to determine the number of points which each evaluator should be assigned in each evaluation period. Use this amount as an average or approximation in assigning submissions.

2. Assign submissions, each to one evaluator during each evaluation period.

There is no "good" way to do this. After experimenting with numerous methods, I have concluded that the most effective way to achieve a balanced distribution while retaining the board members' preferences regarding types of works to evaluate seems, at first glance, to be the "least scientific." It is as follows.

A. List the board members in the order that you will make their assignments. There are no rules in this matter, but several suggestions are

1.) Evaluators possessing skills which are in high demand should be listed before those
This is essential in order that enough works in the former categories to provide a complete assignment are remaining at the time when these evaluators receive their assignments.

Suggestions one through three should be inter-related; e.g., one with an ability to evaluate art who has interest only in art and poetry should be listed before one who has an ability to evaluate art, but is interested in all areas.

B. Starting at the top of the column designated for the first evaluation period, assign works for which the first evaluator would be particularly appropriate to that person in the order in which they occur until the target number of points for that period (see l.c.) is reached. At this point on the page, shift to the column designated for the second evaluation period and repeat this process. Then, shift to the column for the third period and repeat as before.
should be assigned, they may either be assigned first or substituted after this process.

C. Repeat this process with the second and subsequent evaluators until list is complete. When shifting to the next evaluation period, however, begin once again at the top of the column to consider those submissions bypassed in the assignments to other evaluators. Double-check previously assigned evaluators to avoid repetition.

D. When this process is complete, tally the results and make necessary adjustments. Remember that the target number is designed as an average and/or approximation and that a perfect distribution is highly unlikely.

E. Divide submissions and double check this division for distribution.
DISTRIBUTION CHART:
MODEL 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name 1</th>
<th>Name 2</th>
<th>Name 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>(Wirthlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Symula</td>
<td>Tully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
<td>Symula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>(Wirthlin)</td>
<td>Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>(Miller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Studt</td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>Tully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Symula</td>
<td>Studt</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aversa</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>(Wirthlin)</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>(Grader)</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Symula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>(Spencer)</td>
<td>Studt</td>
<td>(Miller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Studt</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Studt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
<td>Studt</td>
<td>Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Symula</td>
<td>Studt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>(Spencer)</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
<td>Studt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Aversa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
<td>Kuhn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Ortenzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EVALUATION TALLY: MODEL 1 (ADJUSTED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Long (4)</th>
<th>Short (2)</th>
<th>Poem (1)</th>
<th>Art (1)</th>
<th>Long (4)</th>
<th>Short (2)</th>
<th>Poem (1)</th>
<th>Art (1)</th>
<th>Long (4)</th>
<th>Short (2)</th>
<th>Poem (1)</th>
<th>Art (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wirthlin (1/4/0)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Spencer (8/0/0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mouzon (0/0/0)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Miller (0/0/0)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(1+F)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avens (8/7/7)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone (9/8/9)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall (7/8/8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison (9/9/8)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendrick (9/8/9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhn (9/8/7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch (8/9/8)</td>
<td>1+F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meiman (8/8/8)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell (6/9/8)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3+6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orsetto (9/8/8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1+F</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studt (8/8/8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>F+F</td>
<td>F+A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symula (9/8/7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tully (6/9/9)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2+1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*Parenthetical summary under name indicates adjusted tally. Circles and arrows indicate adjustments.*

* indicates editors
SUBMISSION EVALUATION: MODEL 2

PRODUCTION SCHEDULE, JANUARY 7 - FEBRUARY 15*

January  7 Editorial Board meeting
evaluation system explained, final formation
of committees, schedule collected from each
board member

15 Submission Deadline

16/17 Editor, Associate Editors meeting
subject evaluation folders prepared,
committee meeting times set

18-27 Evaluation Period
set of subject evaluation folders available
at Honors College office and in residence
hall

21-27 Committee meetings
recommendations prepared for Editorial
Board meeting

28 Editorial Board meeting
selections made

29 Production preparation
selections requiring additional evaluation
delivered to referees, notification letters
prepared, editing begin, art reproduction
arranged

February 1 Notification
Selections finalized, notification letters sent

8 Editing completed
manuscripts marked, meetings with authors
and artists begin

9-10 Editing finalized
completion of meetings with authors and
artists, precise length estimates made

11/12 Layout committee meeting
layout determined, table of contents and
layout dummy prepared

15 Content delivered to University Publications

*This schedule may be condensed if committee meetings are completed
before January 27 or if editing is completed before February 8.
VI.

MAKING SELECTIONS

Because the evaluation process was completed ahead of schedule, the meeting of the editors and the meeting of the full board were both advanced one day. In the meeting of the editors, our task was to organize the information contained in the multitude of evaluations and to present it to the board in the form of recommended selections. Beyond this, no specific method had been designed. In preparation for the first meeting, I grouped the evaluations of each work and arranged them from the most to the least favorable, then grouped the sets of evaluations by subject area. By doing this I realized that there were a few works which all evaluators thought should definitely be included in the journal and more works which all evaluators thought should definitely not be included. I decided to use these groupings as the organizational basis for the selection process.

The method I devised was to discuss, within one subject area, first the works which the evaluators agreed should immediately be accepted and then the works which the evaluators agreed should immediately be rejected. Other works would be held for discussion after all subject areas had been considered in this manner. The only discussion at this stage was to concern whether any of the works mentioned for immediate acceptance or rejection should be transferred to the group held for discussion.

I decided that the first category to be discussed should be art because the number of works which should immediately be accepted
would exceed the available space, thus making it possible to eliminate all other art works from further discussion. Thus, the only ensuing discussion about art would be to determine which works might be allotted half-pages if space permitted. I chose poetry as the next category to discuss because, although there would surely be much further discussion needed, those who had not evaluated a poem could quickly examine it to determine agreement to its suggested disposition. In the case of doubt, poems would be held for discussion, so initial disposition of this area should also be concluded rapidly. During the meeting of the editors, it was most expedient to discuss fiction and miscellaneous, the smallest category, next, leaving academic works to be considered last. The order of these two categories would be reversed at the meeting of the entire board, however, because it was apparent that no immediate decisions regarding fiction and miscellaneous would occur, making it possible to begin discussion of all remaining works at the same time that this category was first discussed.

I tested this procedure at the meeting of the editors and found that it worked quite well. From this meeting came a ranking of the works in each subject area into one of the three categories (Appendix Z). Also, it was agreed that Susan Mouzon would present the recommendations as she had been one of the three who evaluated all of the art works. Although there was a blizzard the following day, the meeting of the entire board was held as scheduled. Because of the snow emergency, associate editor Randy Spencer could not travel to campus, but he called and asked me to voice his opinions at the meeting. Since classes were cancelled Dawn Lynch,
a student staff, was unable to leave the residence hall and so was also unable to attend. The only other absences were Shannon Mitchell, who had not received word that the meeting would be held, and both advisors, who faced the same problem as Randy. Dr. Tammaro however, had given to me his advice concerning poetry that morning.

In general the board agreed with the recommended disposition of the submissions, but in a few cases works which had been recommended for rejection were held for further discussion. One, a second photograph by David Sadler, was chosen by the board to occupy a half-page, but the artist preferred not to crop his work and thus it was not possible to include it in the final group of works. The others were eventually rejected. Of the remaining selections, all but three were dispatched with relative ease. The meeting was naturally lengthy because of the amount of material to consider, but these three works caused such discussion that as much as one-quarter to one-third of the meeting was spent debating their disposition.

The first two discussed were poems, both second works by authors who had already had one poem accepted. Both were board members and their identity was known through their own admission. The board had initially decided to accept up to six poems (fifteen percent of available pages) and had accepted five prior to this debate. Rather than leave the total number of poems at five, the board insisted on accepting both additional works.

The third work in question was a humorous essay, also written by a board member whose identity was known by the rest of the board.
This debate centered on whether the work was offensive and whether it would add variety, rather than on whether it was of high enough quality to be included. Admittedly, this was my fault because I mentioned that several evaluators had considered it offensive without making it clear that they considered its quality to be its chief offense. After reaching a stalemate, the board decided to submit the work to authorities. These authorities considered the work too poor in quality to be accepted and so it was, finally, turned down. This, however, also reflected the feelings privately expressed to me by many board members.

At the end of the meeting, the board did not believe that any of the remaining submissions were of high enough quality to fill the estimated number of remaining pages. Rather than extend an already exhausting endeavor, the board voted unanimously to accept additional prose manuscripts until 10:00 p.m. the following Sunday, February 7, leaving it to the editors to choose the final work(s) to be included. Authors and artists of the twenty submissions accepted (see check marks) and of the other submissions rejected would be notified by letter (Appendix AA) after this final decision had been made. Before adjourning the meeting, I obtained a list of those interested in various post-selection stages of production (Appendix BB).

The only other noteworthy occurrence of the meeting was a regrettable incident concerning one of the immediately rejected poems. As I read the titles of works suggested for immediate rejection, those who had evaluated this poem, began to laugh. One suggested that the poem be read aloud so that those who had not evaluated it would understand why it should be rejected. When I refused, several
board members volunteered to read it to the board. I would not allow this to occur and was thus rather unpopular at the time, but it is essential that the selection meeting does not become a forum in which to ridicule submissions.

The system of grouping submissions into categories for acceptance, rejection, and discussion within each subject area worked quite well to reduce the number of submissions under consideration to a manageable number. To consider first those which are immediately acceptable establishes a standard of comparison by which to judge works recommended for immediate rejection and, later, those which are discussed. Ideally, immediately acceptable works will exceed the amount of available space making it possible to select only the most excellent from among these, as was the case this year in the area of art. Even if this does not occur, the works recommended for immediate acceptance will form a base of selections with which to work.

Using a subject area committee system, this method could be used by each committee to develop specific recommendations from a body of persons familiar with all the works in that area. These recommendations would then be presented in the same manner to the board for approval upon discussion. This procedure would eliminate the time needed within the board meeting this year to allow those who had not evaluated a work the opportunity to become familiar with it, particularly since all board members could conveniently review as many works as they desire before the meeting.
Art and poetry are also the best categories with which to start because the amount of space which can be allotted to them in such a publication is somewhat limited by standard practice. Dr. Wires pointed out that usually no more than ten percent of the available pages is devoted to art and no more than ten percent to poetry in such a publication. This seemed reasonable because works of fiction, essay, or research require far more pages than art or poetry, although fewer such works might be selected. In order to allow these works to be included, it is necessary to limit other areas. The board of Odyssey did decide, however, to expand this limitation to fifteen percent of available pages if there were sufficient outstanding works in these categories and/or to include works from these categories on half pages. The order in which other areas are discussed should vary according to the number of outstanding works and total submissions, dealing first with the subjects which appear most expedient.

A cumbersome but necessary task in the selection process is to determine whether the body of works which the board has decided to accept will match the number of available pages. It may be necessary to reopen discussion on the immediately accepted works in order to reduce the number of selections and, thus, the number of pages. On the other hand, it may be necessary to select works from those held for discussion. In either case, the board needs estimates of the amount of space each work will require. Obtaining these estimates is tedious and generally an exercise in futility, but is nonetheless necessary.
The first step in estimating length of works is to learn the number of characters per line and lines per page which the printer will use. The number of lines on a page with a title will be less and should be considered separately. This year, the printer used a seventy-two character line on a forty-two line page. Title pages were to contain thirty-four lines. To obtain a rough estimate of length, one must determine an average line length of a particular manuscript. This number should be multiplied by the total number of lines in the manuscript to obtain an approximate total number of characters. Then, divide by seventy-two to reach the approximate number of printed lines, subtract thirty-four lines which will compose the title page, and divide by forty-two to reach the number of remaining pages. This number plus one, the title page, is the approximate number of printed pages which would be needed for a given manuscript. The formula for this procedure is,

$$\left[\left[\left(\text{Manuscript line length} \times \text{Manuscript lines}\right)/72\right]-34\right]/72+1$$

One should note, however, that indented quotations and notes will be in a smaller type size and so will not be estimated accurately, that editing will change the length of the work, that typesetters are not predictable, and that whether for these reasons or none at all, most works will run longer than estimated. Unfortunately, it is still necessary to have some estimate of the space required for works accepted.

I believe that there is no way to make the selection process a completely painless one. To have specific recommendations developed
within committees and presented at the general meeting chaired by
the editor should expedite matters to a certain degree. To give
all board members the opportunity to review any submission prior
to this meeting should also help. It is my hope that subsequent
editions will have increased submissions, allowing immediate rejec-
tion of all but the "immediately acceptable" and that this number
will need to be reduced to conform to the available space. To
achieve the last improvement, an even greater effort to obtain
quality submissions must be made long before selections are made.
The result will be a more efficient procedure, but the selection
process will probably never be "easy."
**RECOMMENDATIONS**

(ACCEPT/DISCUSS/REJECT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Poetry</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Fiction &amp; misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Borrelli: Times Square Boys: Life</td>
<td>✓ Hill: Church</td>
<td>✓ (Kendrick: Crisis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Carras: Photogram</td>
<td>✓ Mouzon: Nightmares</td>
<td>✓ Winningham: Whores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Clausung: Drawing</td>
<td>✓ Tully: Damn Me Not</td>
<td>✓ Knies: Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Harrison: Small boy Elevation</td>
<td>Hall: Deluge</td>
<td>C. Miller: Nast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Humiston: Elevation Turntable</td>
<td>✓ Mouzon: Country Mile</td>
<td>Ortenzo: Life After</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Kirkpatrick: Turntable</td>
<td>✓ Stephenson: Curse</td>
<td>✓ Wirthlin: Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Nemcik: Two Worlds</td>
<td>✓ Tully: You Don't Wirthlin: Mirror</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Sadler: Architecture</td>
<td>✓ Wirthlin: You Don't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Bolen: Rendering
- Bone: Shadow
- Harrison: Rendering
- Meyer: Puppy
- Sadler: Old man
- Carras: Two girls
- Craddock: Design
- Kirkpatrick: Trees
- Meyer: Carmichael
- Sadler: Art show
- Sadler: Urban Studies?

Check marks indicate works selected.
Date

Person's Name
Address

Dear _____:

The editorial board of Odyssey has completed the process of evaluating the material submitted for consideration for inclusion in our 198__ edition. We are pleased to accept your work, ___________, for publication in this year's issue.

(omit this paragraph in the case of art work)
Enclosed is a copy of your manuscript marked in red with the editorial changes necessary for publication. Most are minor and have been made merely for conformity to the stylistic practices of Odyssey and the number of available pages. Please retain this copy for your records.

When the issue appears, you will receive three complimentary copies. If you have any questions in the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Odyssey Editor
Date

Person's Name
Address

Dear ________:

The editorial board of Odyssey has completed the process of evaluating the material submitted for consideration for publication in our 198__ edition. We regret that we will not be able to include your work in this year's issue. Thank you, however, for your interest in Odyssey.

Sincerely,

Odyssey Editor
## PRODUCTION COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typing Letters</th>
<th>Layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Meiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouzon</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symula</td>
<td>Mouzon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Symula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirthlin</td>
<td>Tully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wirthlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checking Notes</th>
<th>Proofreading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Mouzon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Wirthlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirthlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ONE:
Masthead
Table of contents
Dedication (set off in box)
--Mr. Ralph J. Whitinger

TWO:
Editorial Board
Editor, Associate Editors, Board
Abbreviated form of submission guidelines
Information on obtaining copies

THREE:
Foreword
--Laura J. Wirthlin, editor

FOUR:
Contributors Page?
Blank?
Other?
VII.
DETERMINING LAYOUT

The layout of the journal was actually determined in the midst of, rather than before, the editing process. I include this section first because the process of editing continued long after the layout was established and because editing is integrally involved in proofreading, which came entirely after layout. The only editing which it is necessary to have completed before determining layout is preliminary editing of prose works in order to obtain a more precise page estimate based on the number of lines expected in the fully edited version of each of these works. Obtaining this estimate is explained in greater detail in section eight.

At the meeting during which the editorial board chose works to be included in the journal, I had obtained a list of board members interested in subsequent stages of production. Those who indicated an interest in the layout of the journal met during the week following the selections. Dr. Wires had suggested that the strongest piece be placed first and that another very strong piece be placed last. He cautioned against beginning or ending with either a poem or an art work because it might appear to be filler used to correct an inaccurate page estimate. The group decided to follow this advice, choosing first the opening and closing works, then determining the relative positions of the remaining prose selections, and finally placing the remaining works within this framework.
The group unanimously decided that "Whores, Gardens, and Love-crumbs..." should be the first work in the journal. "Crisis and Controversy..." was also considered quite strong, but the group agreed that because of its length it should be neither first nor last. "The Building of Canterbury Cathedral" could not be last because it was necessary that this work end on facing pages. Thus, "And to the Republic..." was chosen to be last. Next, the group decided that "The Building of Canterbury Cathedral" would be best placed in the middle of the journal because the layout of the work itself (designed in a previous meeting between myself and Emmett Sponsel) would break the monotony of continuous text. "Crisis and Controversy..." was chosen to be between "Whores, Gardens, and Love-crumbs..." and "The Building of Canterbury Cathedral." "The Significant Other..." would thus be between "The Building of Canterbury Cathedral" and "And to the Republic..."

The group then decided that because of the length of "Crisis and Controversy..." several brief works should immediately precede and follow it. To precede it the group chose a very strong art work and a poem on facing pages, followed by the short story "Time Passing" on facing pages, followed by another set of art and poetry. The art selections were not paired with poems but were placed to promote certain page configurations while avoiding disunity between facing pages. "Crisis and Controversy..." was then followed by several more single page selections leading into "The Building of Canterbury Cathedral." This arrangement was designed to create significant amounts of white space surrounding nine pages of continuous text. Because of this large amount of white space, this last
work was followed almost immediately by "The Significant Other..." (after a poem and a single page containing a poem and art work). The remaining two art works and poem were then used as a visual (and intellectual) break before "And to the Republic..." which concludes the journal.

The poems and art works selected for half pages were not so designated in an attempt to illustrate the poems. The poems were selected because their copy was more suitable for a half page than several other poems and because their content would not create disunity with the art already assigned half pages at the meeting of the editorial board. This art was so assigned because other art works selected could not have been suitably reproduced on a partial page, while these works would have presented problems if reproduced in full-page size. It is probable that the disposition of such works will not be so clear in the future, but this example demonstrates that there are practical methods of attacking this situation.

Pages one through four had already been allocated to editorial matters (Appendix CC), so this procedure completed the layout of the journal. The "contributors page" was later dropped when I discovered that the table of contents would require two pages. It would have been possible to omit the foreword, but the Director of the Honors College had previously pointed out the importance of a foreword to the first edition, and so the contributors page was by necessity omitted. The order and paging of works having been established (Appendix DD), the next step was to prepare a dummy layout diagram for University Publications (Appendix EE). From this diagram, the manuscript would be marked with instructions for the typesetter.
In this description the determination of the layout appears amazingly simple. Indeed, it was the stage of production which took place most nearly as planned. The method of first selecting the beginning and ending works and then choosing the relative positions of other long textual works worked extremely well, and I recommend that this method be used for future editions as well. Placing remaining shorter works so that they provide visual and intellectual pacing within the publication seems the most appropriate general solution to the problem of completing the layout. This simple procedure may not produce the best possible arrangement upon the first attempt, but does allow works to be shifted easily within a basic framework in order to test other options. It is possible that this method will not produce the ultimate layout, but it is improbable that a significantly superior one would indeed be created by another system.

In the future, however, I suggest that a sketch of the layout diagram be made when a tentative order has been determined and that the group review this visual interpretation in order to identify potential weaknesses. In the first edition several art works are grouped between "Crisis and Controversy..." and "The Building of Canterbury Cathedral." This was necessary because of the high proportion of the number of pages within narrative works to the total number of pages. In subsequent editions it may be possible to space art works more evenly throughout the journal, which would contribute, in general, to a better total layout. Also, it is desirable that art and white space be more balanced between right and left (odd and even) pages, although this was not possible in the first edition.
because of previously stated conditions and because art with a left-to-right or right-to-left orientation should be oriented toward the binding. After making judicious adjustments according to these considerations, a final diagram may be prepared for the University Publications office.
### LAYOUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page(s)</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Masthead, contents</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contents, dedication</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Editorial board, etc.</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>&quot;Whores, Gardens, and Love-Crumbs...&quot;</td>
<td>Winningham</td>
<td>Scholarly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;Country Mile&quot;</td>
<td>Mouzon</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>&quot;Time Passing&quot;</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>&quot;Graphite on Strathmore 400&quot;</td>
<td>Clausing</td>
<td>Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>&quot;The Curse&quot;</td>
<td>Stephenson</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>&quot;Crisis and Controversy...&quot;</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
<td>Scholarly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>&quot;Two Worlds in Photographs&quot;</td>
<td>Nemcik</td>
<td>Adver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>&quot;Damn Me Not&quot;</td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27(1/2)</td>
<td>&quot;Black Dove&quot;</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27(1/2)</td>
<td>&quot;Return&quot;</td>
<td>Kirkpatrick</td>
<td>Photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Sadler</td>
<td>Photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-35</td>
<td>&quot;The Building of Canterbury Cathedral&quot;</td>
<td>Feltman</td>
<td>Scholarly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36(1/2)</td>
<td>&quot;Watching the Congregation...&quot;</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36(1/2)</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Carras</td>
<td>Photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-41</td>
<td>&quot;The Significant Other...&quot;</td>
<td>Knies</td>
<td>Scholarly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41(1/2)</td>
<td>&quot;You Don't Fool Me&quot;</td>
<td>Tully</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Photograph Series</td>
<td>Bolen</td>
<td>Photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>&quot;Nightmares&quot;</td>
<td>Mouzon</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>&quot;Times Square&quot;</td>
<td>Borrelli</td>
<td>Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>&quot;And to the Republic...&quot;</td>
<td>Wirthlin</td>
<td>Scholarly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII.
EDITING AND PROOFREADING

In the production of the first edition of *Odyssey*, I intended to involve the editorial board in as many areas of production as possible. In order to involve them in the editing process, I planned that the evaluators would each do preliminary editing on the manuscripts which they evaluated. I thought that this would help them to critically evaluate and make recommendations concerning the manuscripts as well as help me in the more thorough editing of accepted works. Apparently, however, it was unrealistic to expect such detailed evaluations since the evaluators suggested few, if any, changes. This left virtually all of the editing to be done after the selection process.

Before the layout meeting, I gave copies of accepted manuscripts to associate editors and to Jerry Hall, who had volunteered to assist us in this task, requesting their editing suggestions. Meanwhile I attempted to edit each of these manuscripts in a thorough enough manner to obtain precise estimates of the number of pages each work would require. I would then be able to incorporate suggested changes and adjust this estimate by the amount that the additional changes would expand or condense the work as previously edited, thus keeping the work within the limits of the space allocated to it. After another editing, I asked the journal's advisors to read the manuscripts as a final check of our accuracy. Each made a few additional suggestions, most of which were carried out; then each author was consulted to approve the changes. Except in the case of contributors
who had graduated, each manuscript was discussed by me with the author. This was done to conserve the time which would have been needed to mail the manuscripts and to wait for a reply (although this was done with the works of alumni) and to avoid negative reactions of authors to changes made in their manuscripts by frequently reiterating that the changes were minor and were made only for stylistic consistency and because of space limitations. Incidentally, this claim was for the most part true and definitely more accurate than if it had been made about many manuscripts accepted for other publications.

"Editing" of art works required the reproduction as 5" x 7" photographs of works not originally submitted in this form. These 5" x 7" prints were then approved by the artist as were the edited manuscripts. In two cases, art work reproductions had to be redone. One poor quality reproduction of a mounted photograph was reprinted by the artist. Another work was redone because it required special reproduction techniques of which we had been unaware at the time the first 5" x 7" print was made.

This edited material, along with the first four pages and the dummy layout diagram, were then taken to the University Publications office. Rae Morrow, the graduate assistant in this office, was assigned to this publication and once again edited the manuscripts. She then met with me to discuss additional changes which she suggested. She had found one or two spelling errors and proposed changing "which"s and "that"s according to a style book used by University Publications. I approved these alterations, and next the manuscript was given to Emmett Sponsel for him to mark with instructions to the printer.
From this point onward, there was to be no additional editing. When the "galleys" arrived, they were to be marked only with the mistakes which the typesetter had made in setting the original copy as edited. Some additional changes, however, could indeed be made. Still, because an additional charge would be made for these new changes, it was essential to keep them to a minimum, changing only essential matters. The galleys were proofread by as many people as possible, preferably by reading aloud from the galley to a partner checking each word, number, and punctuation mark against the original copy sent to the printer. In this proofreading, capitals, italics, punctuation, indentations, and spaces were read in addition to the text as it would be viewed by its eventual audience. The spelling of each proper noun and the accuracy of each number were also re-checked. Also, the abominable hand-inserted accents in "Crisis and Controversy..." were deleted. They would be replaced later by University Publications.

Finally, I measured the amount of lines per page of the finished journal by using a page of the galleys with thirty-four (for a title page) and forty-two lines of continuous text. I did this rather than merely counting the number of lines because many pages contained quotations in a smaller type size or unusual spacing which would effect the number of lines which would occupy the available space on a page. "The Significant Other..." was a few lines longer in print than we had anticipated, and so I made a note to include forty-three lines per page of this article in order to avoid crowding the poem "You Don't Fool Me." This was possible because the pages of the article were separated by art and poetry from other works which
would have a slightly shorter page length. "Crisis and Contro-
versy..." was many lines longer than we had anticipated. In order
to fit the piece on the number of pages allocated to it, we had to
add approximately one and a half lines per page to the standard
forty-two. Half-line spacing was possible because of the frequency
of quotations set in smaller type. Although this did indeed crowd
the pages somewhat, the article was not preceded or followed by
works with standard page length. In fact, the nearest surrounding
prose works were of unusual layout, which reduced the noticeability
of this difference even further.

I then met with Emmett Sponsel to adjust the dummy journal he
had constructed from a set of galleys. Adjustments included the
addition of the lines per page in "Crisis and Controversy..." (he
had already adjusted "The Significant Other...") and condensation
of the explanatory text to the diagrams in "The Building of Canter-
bury Cathedral." After this meeting, the dummy journal and a set
of the corrected galleys were returned to the printer.

The next proof reading job involved "page proofs," each page
printed on a page of 8½ x 11" paper with the corners of the
correctly-sized page marked. Each change marked on the galleys
was checked as well as the lines immediately preceding and follow-
ing them. In addition, the entire manuscript was read by myself
and Jenny Miller in order to discover whether any other errors
might have been made in the correction process. Indeed, several
significant errors had been made on pages which had required no
changes. These errors had not been in the galleys, which suggests
that all works should be checked thoroughly at every stage of
proofreading. Beginning with the page proofs, spacing and alignment were also carefully checked. Using the corner markings on the page proofs I outlined on a separate sheet of paper the size of a journal page (6" x 9") and within this outline, its margins (based on several page proofs of standard length). On this outline I also indicated the proper position for a page number on both odd- and even-numbered pages. By laying this paper over each page proof, I discovered several positioning errors and several page numbers placed in the wrong corner of the page. After making notations regarding these errors, I met with Rae Morrow and Emmett Sponsel to mark the corrections on a set of proofs to be returned to the printer.

The printer then returned a correctly-sized version of the journal bound in correct order as the finished journal would be (although with saddle-stitching rather than perfect binding). This version, however, was photographed from the printing plates and thus was not on the paper which would be used in the finished journal nor in the proper color of ink. This version, called the "browns," was in fact blue. The browns were checked as carefully as the page proofs. Had there been no mistakes, the next delivery of the printer would have been the finished product, but because there were several errors and because University Publications had decided to add the accent markings to "Crisis and Controversy..." at this stage, a second set of browns was required.

The printer returned only those pages on which corrections had been needed. These pages, however, were printed on the size of paper which would be used in the journal and thus also included
with each corrected page the page which would appear in a symmetrical position in the finished publication (e.g., a corrected page nineteen appeared with page thirty, although page thirty had needed no corrections). This occurrence made the second "set" of browns somewhat confusing, but reduced the possibility of new errors on unaffected pages. On the returned pages only one error was found: the word "or" in the table of contents entry for "And to the Republic..." was once again typeset incorrectly, this time with a lower-case rather than a capital "o." Because this was such a minor error, noticeable only if one compared each table of contents entry to the title of the work appearing in the text of the journal, and because the printer had already redone this word four times, Rae Morrow, Emmett Sponsel, and I decided to approve all of the pages rather than to incur the delay of another correction and the risk of further errors.

When the "final version" of Odyssey arrived, I went to the Honors College and proofread the finished edition in order to ascertain that no additional errors had been made. Unfortunately, when I took a copy from the box, a significant error was immediately obvious: the journal had been "saddle-stitched" instead of perfect bound. I called University Publications and asked Emmett Sponsel how this had occurred. After consulting the contract and determining that perfect binding was indeed specified, he said that he would investigate further and call me back. A short while later, he reported that the printer had been authorized by Purchasing and Central Stores to change this specification. I then explained this situation to Dr. Vander Hill, who said that he would either sign
the purchase order accepting the saddle-stitched journals or call Purchasing about the matter, refusing to authorize payment until a satisfactory explanation was provided. Believing that it would be impossible to continue publication of the journal according to our standards if anyone could change the specifications without consulting or even informing the Honors College or editorial board, I requested that Dr. Vander Hill call Purchasing and obtain at the very least a precise description of their authority in such matters.

When called, Mr. Tom Brinson of Purchasing checked his records and discovered that no such change had been authorized. He promised to begin an investigation of the matter the following morning. The printer now informed Brinson that University Publications had authorized the change. Brinson contacted everyone whom the printer might have approached for authorization. All of these people stated that they had not ever discussed this matter with the printer before the copies of *Odyssey* were delivered incorrectly bound. Within a week, the boxes of journals were removed from the Honors College and within a week of this time correctly bound copies were delivered. There remains some mystery regarding the resolution of the investigation, but the Honors College was not charged for the additional printing.

I thoroughly proofread the second "final version" upon arrival. Three words in one of the academic works was slightly out of horizontal alignment in this edition, but I decided that it was not worth the necessary effort of a third printing to correct this slight defect and that it was unlikely that another printing would be approved if I requested it. Thus, I approved this edition, ending the process of proofreading and editing.
The single greatest difficulty in the editing process was time. The first instance in which the difficulty was noticed was the amount of time between selections and the target date to have the manuscripts to University Publications. The scarcity of time rushed the editing process and caused us to miss two or three errors subsequently caught by Rae Morrow as well as a few not noticed until the galleys were received from the printer. Additional time would have allowed another reading of the works and involvement of additional board members who could not adjust their schedules to the existing time requirements. Allowing additional time for initial editing will be even more essential in the future as the journal, and consequently the amount of material to be edited, increases in size. This must be done by having an earlier deadline and a compact selection process because all material must be delivered to University Publications by mid-February (as it was this year) in order to allow sufficient time for printing and delivery.

The time needed for editing could be used most productively if more board members are included in the process. This should be a requirement for associate editors, and other board members should be encouraged to participate as well. One set of the works could be divided among the associate editors, each receiving one-third of the material and carefully editing it (without marking on the manuscript) within a period of time, then each exchanging the set of works received for those of another and repeating the process. In this way (as evaluations were organized in Appendix Y) each work would be edited by three persons after three such periods. Another set of copies could be reserved for other board members to examine
according to their available time. Meanwhile, the editor could be using the file copies of the works to compile his or her own list of changes to be made. After the others have listed their suggestions, the editor can incorporate all of the lists into the final editing of each manuscript. The amount of time needed for this will vary according to the amount of material, but should be kept to a minimum. A few days should be added to this amount in order to allow the editor an additional reading after a brief period of not examining the manuscripts. This will give the editor the opportunity to see each work with a fresher perspective and perhaps to catch any remaining flaws.

The thoroughness of the editing also needs to be improved. Many board members apparently believed that errors such as misspellings and verb agreements were the only matters which should be changed during editing. In order to give those editing the works a clearer idea of the scope of editing, I suggest that each be shown the file copies of previously published works. The amount and nature of the changes in these works should demonstrate that editing is a more complicated process than they had originally assumed. Also, the editor should remind them that they should not hesitate to mention details which they suspect are trivial, because if a detail is indeed "trivial," it will not be used in the final editing. In other words, the editor should assure them that it is far better to be too careful in their editing than not careful enough. In addition, a set of guidelines for editing (Appendix FF) should be given to each board member involved in the editing process as a reference to answer questions regarding stylistic and mechanical standards of Odyssey.
During proofreading of material returned by the printer, time is also an important concern. The time between the arrival of galleys, page proofs, or browns at University Publications and their return to the printer should be as brief as possible. In proofreading the galleys, it is desirable that board members work in pairs and that the entire set of galleys be read at least twice (by different pairs). This requires at least three board members in addition to the editor. To find at least three persons who can proofread at the necessary time, the editor should begin with the associate editors, as this is one of their responsibilities. Should circumstances prevent one or more associate editors from participating in this stage of production, the editor should continue to the list of board members. In either case, all those who have indicated interest in editing should be contacted because it is extremely unlikely that there will ever be too many proofreaders available. In proofreading page proofs and browns, board members can easily work individually and not so many readers are needed as for the galleys. The editor should once again first contact the associate editors and then additional board members until several are found who are available to proofread page proofs and, later, one additional person is found to read each set of browns.

By the time the first set of browns is returned to the printer, the University Publications staff may well be tired of seeing the editor. In spite of this, I believe that the editor should proofread every version of the journal which is returned to Ball State for approval. This does not mean that the University Publications staff is in any way careless, but only that it has many other
publications with which it is concerned, while the editor of Odyssey has a primary commitment to this specific one. Happily, the only remaining proofreading job is the completed journal. This is a necessary check before the distribution of the journal to ascertain that there are no pages upside-down, out of order, blank, or missing and that there are no other errors which were made between the return of the final set of browns and the delivery of the journals. If such an error is found, the printer will reprint the order. In the event that an editing or proofreading error is undiscovered until this time, I suggest that an errata sheet correcting the error be included in each copy, rather than hand-correcting the issues.

Progression through these stages should be noted on an Odyssey worksheet (Appendix GG) in order to verify that each necessary task has been completed.

The difficulty with the printer regarding the binding specifications demonstrates the importance of carefully examining the journal at every stage of production. More significantly, however, it demonstrates the importance of defining standards for high quality and adhering to them. Because the students involved had a serious commitment to quality, the university administration supported the Honors College and editorial board even though the issue engendered discontent among many who considered the binding of a student publication a minor matter.
GUIDELINES FOR EDITING AND PROOFREADING

Author: The author's name should appear below the title. "By" should not be used in the heading.

Paragraphs: The first paragraph of a work should not be indented. The first paragraph of a major subsection (usually immediately following a skipped line) should also not be indented.

Quotations/Excerpts: Errors in quotations or excerpts within a work should not be corrected. In the case of an obvious mistake, include "sic" to note that it is the author's error rather than an editing or printing error. Any quotation exceeding five lines of typescript should be indented in block style. Lengthy excerpts should be preceded and followed by a space, but not indented in block style.

Style: Formal usage should be used in scholarly works. Abbreviations and contractions should not be used in the text. Slang and jargon should not be used. All foreign words and terms should be underlined. Pronouns should have identifiable antecedents. In general, "that" should be used in the defining sense (e.g., "The lawnmower that is
in the garage is broken") and "which" should be used in the non-defining sense (e.g., "The lawnmower, which is in the garage, is broken") to add further information.

Creative works may not conform to these stylistic practices because of the style in which they are written or the use of dialogue. Any item not immediately attributable to these reasons, however, should be noted.

**Punctuation:**

Punctuation should incorporate conservative patterns. A comma should be used following the item in a sequence before "and" or "or" and to separate subordinate clauses. A comma should not be used after a short introductory clause unless the word or phrase is being emphasized.

**Dates:**

A comma should not be used when only the month and year are given, but should be used to separate the day and year when the day is included. No apostrophe should be used when referring to a decade.

**Numbers:**

Numbers under one hundred and all those which can be written in two words should be written out. Words rather than mathematical symbols should be used. Exception: passages stressing statistical analysis or emphasizing comparative figures may use numerals and symbols.
Other matters: In matters not listed here, the Manual of Style published by the University of Chicago Press (12th Edition) or the Turabian Manual for Writers should be consulted for further guidance.

Standard Proofreading Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert comma</td>
<td>To prevent this A we</td>
<td>^ ^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert apostrophe</td>
<td>The book's cover</td>
<td>v v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert quotation mark</td>
<td>In &quot;The Raven&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert hyphen</td>
<td>nineteenth-century furniture</td>
<td>= =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert parentheses</td>
<td>(12th Edition)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert semicolon</td>
<td>carried out then</td>
<td>&amp; &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert colon</td>
<td>as follows</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert period</td>
<td>process This should</td>
<td>? ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert question mark</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td>? /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set in boldface type</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon Canterbury</td>
<td>/ /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set in roman type</td>
<td>E.E. Cummings</td>
<td>rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set in italic type</td>
<td>Tulips and Chimneys</td>
<td>ital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set in capitals</td>
<td>critic</td>
<td>caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set in small capitals</td>
<td>Linda D. Winningham</td>
<td>sc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set in lower case</td>
<td>GOLDEN cherub</td>
<td>lc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-case letter</td>
<td>AND TO THE POEM</td>
<td>/ /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align type</td>
<td>more than if</td>
<td>\ /</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let it stand; restore words crossed out in error
Delete
Delete and close up
Close up
Insert space
Close up and insert space
Paragraph
No paragraph
Insert marginal addition (from original copy only)
Spell out (circle letters involved)
Transpose (circle letters involved)
Wrong font (circle letter involved)
Move to left
Move to right
Lower
Raise
Broken or dirty type (circle letters)
Space evenly
Push down entire space

Proofreading

Galleys, page proofs, and browns are to be proofread, not copy-edited. Editing errors should be noted, however, because it may be necessary to pay the additional charge in order to change significant ones. Use the standard symbols listed above to note changes. If none of these symbols apply, explain the correction.
or question in any other suitable way. Do not mark on the galleys, page proofs, or browns--use separate pages!

Galleys: galleys should be read three times, once according to each of the following methods. The order in which these readings occur may vary.
1.) Read each work examining only proper nouns and numbers. The spelling of each proper noun and the accuracy of each number should be carefully checked against the original manuscript.
2.) Read each work as would be reader, consulting the original manuscript about any item which seems unusual.
3.) Read each work aloud to a partner who is following the original manuscript. Read all punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing or unusual spacing, and other divergences from continuous text as they occur in the text of the manuscript.

Page Proofs: page proofs should be read twice, once according to each of the following methods. The order in which these readings occur may vary, but it is probably easiest to do them in the order in which they are listed.
1.) Locate each error marked in red on the galleys and check this with the same location in the page proofs. Carefully compare the page proofs
to the galley for several lines preceding and following the corrected error in order to ascertain that no new errors were made in the correction process.

2.) Read each work as would a reader, consulting the galleys or original manuscript about any item which seems unusual. Also, check paging and layout.

Browns: browns should be read in the same manner as the page proofs. This reading, however, must be done at the University Publications office because there is only one copy and it must remain in the office at all times.
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IX.

DISTRIBUTING THE JOURNAL

From the earliest planning stage of the journal, the Director of the Honors College and I realized that mailing the issue to all those in some way affiliated with the Honors College would not be the best method of distribution. Persons having little interest in the publication would immediately discard it, wasting the copy of the journal and the money spent to publish and mail it. To prevent this, we decided to use a controlled distribution system, mailing copies only to those who we were fairly certain would have an interest in receiving them. Others would be able to obtain a copy by signing for it at the Honors College. Signatures, or rather, initialing of names on the Honors College computer listing, would be used to insure that individuals did not return to obtain multiple copies, depleting the supply before others had obtained a copy. This system, we believed, would allow distribution to all those desiring the publication (and who we specifically desired to receive it) while reducing waste.

Organizing the distribution of the journal, then, consisted of two parts: compiling a list of those to whom we would mail the journal and devising a way in which to notify others that the journal was available. Copies would be mailed to contributors who had graduated and thus could not pick up their three complimentary copies at the Honors College, the editorial board's advisors, Honors programs at other institutions from which we regularly receive publications and other news, administrators whose position involves
contact with the Honors College, Departmental Honors Representatives, and faculty teaching Honors classes during the year of publication or scheduled to teach Honors classes the following year. To this list, I added the person to whom the first edition was dedicated, the Honors advisor, the editorial board, and Rae Morrow, an Honors College alumna who worked on the journal as a graduate assistant at the University Publications office. The Provost and the Dean of Undergraduate Programs would each be sent three copies because their positions are such that they would probably have the opportunity and desire to make their additional copies available to others interested in Honors. The editorial board's advisors and Dr. Jon Hendrix would also each receive three copies because their extreme efforts on behalf of the journal indicate that they, too, would have use for additional copies. Mailing copies to those on this list (Appendix HH) would be both a courtesy to those who have shown an interest in Honors and Odyssey and a means of publicity.

To inform others of the availability of the journals, several methods would be used. Because each contributor was to receive three complimentary copies, I would send a memo (Appendix JJ) to each as soon as the journals arrived, inviting the contributor to pick up the copies reserved for him or her. The forthcoming availability of Odyssey had been announced in the Spring Quarter News and Notes (Appendix II). This announcement was intended to alert students to the journal's publication so that additional notices would attract their attention. Rather than merely having the standard brief note attached to its cover (Appendix KK), each copy of the journal sent to Departmental Honors Representatives and Honors
faculty would be accompanied by a memo (Appendix LL) thanking the person for his or her support and requesting that students be informed of the journal's availability. In addition, announcements (Appendix MM) would be posted in the Honors residence halls and other locations where they would be likely to be seen by Honors students.

The actual distribution of the journal then involved mailing the appropriate number of copies to those on the mailing list and making the journals available at the Honors College office. The student secretary of the Honors College addressed campus mail envelopes to all those marked in red in the master copy of the Ball State telephone directory and listed by me on a supplementary sheet compiled from the remainder of the mailing list and typed mailing labels to those on the list with off-campus addresses. I then sorted the campus mail envelopes into three categories: persons to receive multiple copies, Departmental Honors Representatives and Honors faculty, and other. After alphabetizing the latter two categories, to avoid repetition, I placed a copy of the memo for DHR's and Honors faculty into the appropriate envelopes in the first category as well as those envelopes in the second category. I also placed notes from Dr. Vander Hill to other Honors directors in the appropriate envelope. These envelopes needed only journals to be complete, so I stacked them separately from the others. In the remaining envelopes I would place a journal with the brief note folded over its front cover, so next I duplicated, signed, cut, and folded these in preparation for the arrival of the journals. Finally, I duplicated the notice to be posted around campus.
When the journals arrived, and I had checked the final version, I had only to fill and seal the envelopes. The first set of envelopes already included all the additional material, so I completed these first. Then I filled the remaining envelopes with journals over which I had placed cover notes. A simple job, completing the mailing process nevertheless took several hours. In a now empty box, I "reserved" copies for contributors. Then I left a full box of journals beside the Honors College secretary's desk with the computer printout for Honors College students to initial and a legal pad for non-Honors College students to sign when obtaining a copy. When these tasks were completed, I posted the notices for general distribution.

The effectiveness of this distribution system remains to be seen. I believe that the current mailing list is a good base on which to build. As the mailing list for the Honors College newsletter has grown I expect the list for *Odyssey* to grow. Some who see this edition will ask to be added to the mailing list, and more will be added in this way with each subsequent edition. I also believe that the general distribution from the Honors College office is the most practical solution at the present time. One improvement I would make, however, is to construct an assembly line for preparing the journals to be mailed.

This distribution system should be supplemented in several ways. First, several copies of *Odyssey* should be taken each day to the Honors College session of orientation. They should be made available along with applications for the editorial board to
interested incoming freshmen. When the next academic year begins, editorial board members should also take journals and applications to Honors classes in order to provide information and to encourage student involvement in *Odyssey*. These efforts will increase the exposure of *Odyssey*, aiding distribution and recruitment. Finally, after retaining a reasonable stock supply for future requests, remaining copies could be distributed through an announcement in the *Daily News*. The announcement, however, should be written by a member of the editorial board rather than being entrusted to *Daily News* staff.
Off-Campus Individuals (one copy each)

All persons on mailing list for Honors College alumni

Off-campus contributors (3 copies)

Person to whom journal is dedicated

Off-Campus Honors Institutions (one copy each)

Dr. C. Grey Austin
University Honors Office
9 Denney Hall
164 W. 17th Avenue
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dr. Warner O. Chapman
Director, Honors Program
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Dr. Samuel I. Clark
Director of Honors College
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

Dr. Ira Cohen
Director, Honors Program
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761

Dr. Wallace Kay
Dean of Honors
University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

Dr. Bill Mech
Director, Honors Program
Boise State University
Boise, Idaho 83725

Dr. David Miller
General Honors Program
245 F Main Hall
University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse
LaCrosse, Wisconsin 54601

Dr. John Portz
3151 Undergraduate Library
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

Dr. Joseph R. Riley
Director, Honors Program
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee 38111

* Dr. Scott Vaughn
Editor, Forum for Honors
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

The Cockroach Staff
Honors Program
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

* address to which this journal is sent should vary according to current editor
On-Campus (one copy each, except as noted)

All persons indicated with red check marks in the faculty and staff section of the Honors College's master Ball State telephone directory. This list should contain the following categories of persons* and should be kept up-to-date.

Odyssey Advisor(s) (3 copies)
Departmental Honors Representatives
Honors Faculty for year of Publication
Faculty scheduled to teach Honors classes in upcoming year
Honors Subcommittee members
Honors College Curricular Advisor
Departmental Chairmen
Deans of each College
Dean of Undergraduate Programs (3 copies)
Director of Student Programs
Ball State University President
Ball State University Provost (3 copies)
Ball State University Associate Provost
Director of Public Information Services
Other faculty and staff with interest in/contact with Honors College
Other faculty and staff with interest in/contact with Odyssey

In addition, all on-campus non-contributor members of the editorial board should receive copies

* Overlapping can be eliminated by alphabetizing the addressed envelopes before filling and mailing them.
Spring 1982 (in "Announcements")

ODYSSEY

The first edition of Odyssey, the SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE JOURNAL of the Honors College, should be available (at no cost) in early May. Copies can be obtained at the Honors College office at that time. Students should be on the lookout for signs telling the exact availability date of the journals.

The works of nineteen Honors students (two of whom are alumni) will be featured in this issue. Those wishing to submit material for next year's Odyssey are asked to watch for information concerning this which will be posted next autumn.

Students interested in serving on the 1982-83 editorial board should complete an application, which will be available at the Honors College office, in September.
To: Odyssey contributors
From: The Editorial Board of Odyssey

The 1982 edition of Odyssey is now available for distribution. As a contributor, you are entitled to three copies of the journal. To obtain them, please present this notice at the Honors College office (WB 207).

If, for some reason, you desire additional copies of the publication, it may be possible for you to obtain a reasonable number (subject to availability) during finals week. For further information, please contact Laura Wirthlin (ph. 5150).
This publication, *Odyssey*, is the first edition of the Honors College's scholarly/creative journal. The Honors College and the editorial board would like you to have this copy with our compliments. We would appreciate receiving your comments and suggestions.

Sincerely,
To: All 1981-82 Honors Faculty and Departmental Honors Representatives
From: The Editorial Board of Odyssey

Thank you for your support in the production of the first edition of the Honors College scholarly/creative journal Odyssey. We greatly appreciate your suggestions of students to serve on the editorial board and of works to be submitted.

The journal is now available for distribution. The Honors College and the editorial board would like you to have this copy with our compliments. Please inform your Honors students that they may obtain a copy at the Honors College office (WB 207).

Also, we hope that you will continue to support this endeavor by suggesting students to serve on the editorial board (which will be selected next September) and works to be considered for the 1983 edition of Odyssey. For further information, contact Randy Spencer, editor for the 1982-83 academic year.
Odyssey

The Honors College Scholarly / Creative Journal

Is

Now Available

At The

Honors College (WB207)
In retrospect, two matters seem to be of consistent major significance throughout the production of Odyssey. The most obvious is quality, and, within this area, the definition of "Honors." The other is involvement, particularly of the editorial board, but also of the Honors population as a whole. Many individual aspects of producing Odyssey could be done better in future editions, but I have attempted to discuss them in the appropriate sections, and so will direct my conclusions to consideration of these more general matters of quality and involvement.

The support of the administration in the dispute about binding style and the response of those who have at this time received the journal indicates that the first edition of Odyssey set and met a standard of high quality. A constant effort must be made to maintain and improve the quality of this publication. This can be done naturally by generating increased interest in the editorial board and publication and thus increasing competition for selection. Improvement should also be made by design, raising the standards for selection far more than merely expanding the journal itself and decreasing the editorial board's size if enough truly qualified applicants are not available.

It is also my belief that Odyssey should remain an "Honors" endeavor and to do this, "Honors" must be more clearly defined. I think that the problem stems from the history of the Honors College, in that "Honors College" became the new name of the Honors Program.
which was primarily, if not entirely, a general honors program. The Honors College is now much more, yet the term "Honors College" still designates the general honors program. The solution which I suggest, and which I believe will benefit far more endeavors than Odyssey, is to redesignate the Honors College as the body which encompasses Honors education programs at Ball State University. The Honors College would then include, as it does now, a General or University Honors Program (the new name for what is now referred to as the Honors College), the Departmental Honors Program, the Undergraduate Fellows Program, the Honors College Summer Program (for high school students), the Whiting Scholars Program, and various other scholarship programs, as well as any future endeavors. Such a change would allow the use of "Honors College" as a clear requirement for involvement with Odyssey while allowing a broad spectrum of students and faculty to participate and insuring flexibility for the future.

In addition to allowing a broad spectrum of students and faculty to become involved with Odyssey, it is necessary to encourage them to do so. Additional publicity in the form of posters, letters, and announcements will be useful, but personal contact will probably prove once again to be the most effective means of generating interest. Also, the Director of the Honors College and Odyssey's advisor should be particularly encouraged to enlist support for and involvement with Odyssey through all of their roles in the university.

Each member of the editorial board also must become significantly involved with Odyssey. The members are responsible for creating interest in others as well as for the production of the journal itself. Ideally, the editor should lead and coordinate the
functions of the board, delegating responsibility rather than completing the individual tasks. During production of the first edition, this ideal was not achieved, largely because no one knew in advance what to expect, and developing the necessary group of board members for a given purpose often took longer than the time available. Now able to see the production of *Odyssey* as a whole, I recommend that a number of "committees" be formed at the first meeting of the board. Although each committee member would probably not fulfill every eventual duty of a committee, this system would provide a starting point for each task and would delegate to each board member a number of specific responsibilities requiring active involvement with *Odyssey*.

The committees which I suggest are those which I would have liked to have been able to call on during the production of the first edition. Those board members who volunteered for the tasks which I now devolve upon committees were indeed the most valuable of members (a matter which should be considered in selecting the editorial board and its officers). They are: for organizing the editorial board and obtaining submissions, publicity; for evaluating submissions, art, poetry, fiction and miscellaneous, and academic (possibly research and essay categories) evaluation; layout; editing; proofreading; and distribution committees.

There will, of course, be new difficulties each year. As old problems are eliminated, additional ones will be revealed. Regardless of whether my suggestions are followed, I hope that this record makes it possible for subsequent editors to envision the publication of *Odyssey* in its entirety and with this knowledge to develop some workable system.