eon
editorial office news

We're Here for You

By Meghan McDevitt
Editorial Assistant
GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Altmetrics, ORCID, COPE flowcharts, CrossCheck/iThenticate, Open Access, Retraction Watch—doesn't it seem like we are overrun with new terms, trends, and processes at every turn? It is our job to stay abreast of these topics, learn and explain new features, and implement procedures, all while staying on top of the journal production schedule (and our email inboxes). At times, it can be overwhelming. But this is where ISMTE and *EON* can help. When you encounter something new or have a question on how to approach a situation, I hope you turn to your colleagues at ISMTE or check out past articles from *EON*. We're here for you.

Alethea Gerding, Managing Editor of the *Journal of Prosthodontics*, shares her experience with a plagiarism case that eventually was called out by Retraction Watch. Despite following COPE recommendations, she was met with frustrating situations when the authors disputed the accusation and the case ended up on Retraction Watch.

Has your journal jumped on board yet with alternative metrics? Mike Buschman, Andrea Michalek, and Marianne Parkhill from Plum Analytics talk about the need for other metrics, aside from the Impact Factor, that take into account the social impact of a published article. Tools like Plum Analytics look at metrics from over 30 sources including Facebook, Twitter, Google+, PLOS, PubMed, SlideShare, and CrossRef to help authors understand the reach and impact of their work.

ISMTE now has three local groups: Chicagoland, Washington, DC Area, and North Carolina - Research Triangle Park Area. If you live near one of these places, please visit the ISMTE website to register and find out when the next meeting will take place. ISMTE Board Member Jan Higgins provides an update on the RTP area

ISMTE
INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF MANAGING AND TECHNICAL EDITORS

local group—they have some exciting things happening in North Carolina! If you are interested in starting a new local group, Jan also serves as the society's Regional Group Coordinator and can help you get started.

The beauty (or maybe curse) of being an Editor is that we can work from pretty much anywhere as long as there is a computer and Internet connection, which means that many of us might work from a home office (or nearest coffee shop). Ruth Thaler-Carter, a seasoned freelance Editor and writer, provides some tips and suggestions for establishing a freelance editing career.

Finally, our Winding Path article this month comes from Lisa Daitch of Origin Editorial. Lisa shares how past experience as an administrative assistant led to her position as a Managing Editor, giving her the flexibility she needed to finish her degree.

EON is always looking for contributors! Please send me your ideas and articles at mmcdevitt@ asge.org.

Huh???

These were actual headlines from newspapers that obviously need a clear-thinking copyeditor!

- Something went wrong in jet crash, expert says
- Safety experts say school bus passengers should be belted
- Drunk gets 9 months in violin case
- Squad helps dog bite victim
- Enraged cow injures farmer with ax
- Plane too close to ground, crash probe told
- Miners refuse to work after death
- Two soviet ships collide, one dies
- Never withhold herpes infection from loved one
- War dims hope for peace
- Iraqi head seeks arms
- Panda mating fails; veterinarian takes over
- If strike isn't settled quickly, it may last a while
- Cold wave linked to temperatures
- Couple slain; police suspect homicide

You're Never Safe: One Journal's Experience With Retracting an Article for Plagiarism

By Alethea B. Gerding, MA
Managing Editor
Journal of Prosthodontics

This tale of a small dental specialty journal (*Journal of Prosthodontics*) begins with us thinking we'd dodged the plagiarism bullet and ends with us being called out by Retraction Watch for making a "mockery of the retraction process." Did we handle the incident properly? Did we make a mockery of the retraction process? Maybe we did. Here is the story; you be the judge.

In February 2011, Wiley provided our journal with an iThenticate account, and my EIC and I breathed a shared sigh of relief. We'd made it this far without publishing any plagiarized work and now had the system in place to ensure we never would. Six weeks later, an email landed in the EIC's mailbox. A researcher wrote to say that an article we had published in 2006 had plagiarized from large sections of an article she had published in 2005.

We thanked her for bringing this issue to our attention and promised to take the accusations seriously. I uploaded the article to iThenticate, where the problems were immediately evident. The entire introduction was copied. Even the first 15 references were the same references, in the same order, in the same places in the text, as in the plagiarized article.

It seemed a pretty clear-cut case of plagiarism, but we weren't quite ready to accuse the authors. We hoped we could find a legitimate reason for the copying. Maybe this was simply boilerplate text used in many papers of the same type. We ran iThenticate checks on the plagiarized manuscript, looking to see if the paragraphs in question had appeared elsewhere. If they had, iThenticate didn't have them. I went to the university library to see if some of the older references (that may not appear in iThenticate's database) used some of the same text. All this seemed like a long shot, but certainly worth trying. Unfortunately, my research made it clear that this was not boilerplate text.

At this stage, I knew action was likely necessary, and I knew I could go no further without consulting a COPE flowchart, in this instance, "Suspected plagiarism in a published manuscript." We'd already accomplished the first four steps (plagiarism accusation, thank the accuser, check the degree of copying, make a plagiarism determination). Those first four steps are intuitive. Still, should the issue arise again, I plan to consult the COPE flowchart immediately.

Step 5 is to contact the corresponding author, "ideally enclosing signed authorship statement… and documentary evidence of plagiarism." I prepared iThenticate reports and scanned copies of the plagiarized articles, highlighted in the appropriate places. Unfortunately, after five years, we no longer had copyright forms or cover letters in our files, but Wiley did. After I'd drafted the text of the email our EIC would send to the accused authors, our journal manager shared the evidence we had with the Wiley Intellectual Property Group (IPG). Once the IPG agreed with the text of our email (see Box 1 for template), the EIC sent our accusation to the authors.

Everything seemed straightforward, with little for the authors to argue. We were naïve. The authors were outraged and incredulous the allegations would take 5 years to surface. They asked to know who had originally accused them, saying that surely this person must have a problem with them personally, or perhaps was pursuing a vendetta to show a flaw in our journal's review and publication process.

In more than one email, the authors lambasted our review process and blamed us for the plagiarism. Then they noted that they relied on published works only because their English skills were

Box 1. Template of letter to authors alleging plagiarism.

Dear Dr. X,

Earlier this month, we were alerted to the fact that portions of your article, "TITLE" (CITATION), seemed to be directly copied from an article published in JOURNAL TITLE in DATE (CITATION).

In investigating these claims, we also found other articles your article quotes heavily from:

- CITATION
- CITATION

I have attached several documents to this email:

1. Each article mentioned above
2. Your article
3. A report detailing the similarities
4. Your signed copyright form, in which you assert that the work is original

We take these allegations seriously, and are concerned that they reflect poorly on the *Journal of Prosthodontics'* standards for review and publication, and that this may even require the retraction of your published article.

Before we take that drastic step, we wish to provide you with a chance to respond to the allegations above, in the hope that this may have been a simple misunderstanding.

Please respond within thirty days, before we take any further action, including retraction of your article.

---

limited. They provided their raw data and a chart showing how their work and results differed from previously published work (including that which was plagiarized). Reviewing the raw data, we had no reason to doubt the results and conclusions of the work, nor did we wish to throw into doubt the research that had already cited this paper.

The EIC grew increasingly frustrated with the authors' accusations and dodges, none of which satisfactorily explained the plagiarism. Upon final consultation with the IPG, we retracted the article for plagiarism. As part of the retraction statement, we wrote, "While the Editor feels confident that the results of the study are valid and the research itself was ethical, the retraction has been agreed to due to significant overlap with previously published articles, partly as a result of the authors' unfamiliarity with the English language."

The authors, unhappy, sent several angry emails, but we felt we had been entirely fair. Case closed. We thought. Two months later, we found ourselves featured in Retraction Watch. Said the blog:

> Although we get why the authors might want to stress how valid and ethical their results were, we're not sure why the editor felt it was so important to note that in the retraction notice.…But we're not quite convinced by the lack of familiarity with English claim.

> After all, the first author is on the faculty at the University of Sydney—where, we're pretty sure, they speak English fluently. As they do in England, we're told. That's where we see a listing for the second author…who evidently has spent time at University College London.

While we're all for giving authors the benefit of the doubt, we doubt the benefit of letting them make a mockery of the retraction process.

Yes, we were called out for making a "mockery of the retraction process." While it is my experience that nonnative English speakers are not automatically bestowed fluency upon arriving at an English-speaking institution, it is true that they likely had colleagues who could have helped their writing without resorting to plagiarism. It is also true that we did not need to add that statement to our retraction.

Should we have? I'm still not sure. Leaving it out would have kept us off Retraction Watch's radar. On the other hand, our research into the case did lead us to believe that the results and conclusions were legitimate, and we did not want to invalidate further studies based on the retracted one. Then again, it's not as if those studies were built solely upon this one, and likely wouldn't be invalidated simply by this retraction.

We also chose not to respond to Retraction Watch. The issue died, with two comments on the post, one seeming to defend our contention about nonnative English speakers at English-speaking institutions.

What did we learn?

1. You're never safe. You may have policies in place to prevent plagiarism, but nothing is foolproof, and those policies may not have been in place when the incident happened. Be prepared.
2. Follow COPE guidelines.
3. Use the resources you have available (COPE, your publisher, ISMTE). You may have never dealt with plagiarism before, but they certainly have, and will have advice.
4. If retraction is necessary, use caution if you step outside the bounds of a bare-bones retraction statement. This will put you on Retraction Watch's radar. Warn your EIC that this might happen.
5. You do not need to respond to Retraction Watch. You may successfully explain yourself, or you could potentially make the situation worse. Consider carefully.

But the number one lesson we learned? Don't ever get too self-congratulatory. Don't be as naïve as we were. iThenticate didn't protect us from 5-year-old plagiarism. All our evidence didn't protect us from angry authors, and a retraction isn't always the end of the story, especially if you find yourself ridiculed in a public forum because of it.

Attention BELS Members – Travel Award to Attend ISMTE Meetings

The Executive Council of the Board of Editors in the Life Sciences (BELS) wishes to assist BELS members in attending meetings that would help them in their careers as manuscript editors. Both ISMTE meetings are eligible so if you are a BELS member and wish to attend one of the ISMTE meetings, here are the details:

Twice each year, the BELS Executive Council will award reimbursement up to US$500 for one BELS-certified editor to attend, in person or online, a professional meeting, workshop, or other qualifying activity by January 31, 2015.

To be eligible, you must have an ELS or ELS(D) designation and be a dues-paying member of the Board of Editors in the Life Sciences. The awardee must submit registration receipt and other expense receipts for reimbursement within one month after the activity. Receipts received after this time are not eligible for reimbursement.

To apply, you may complete and submit the form at the BELS website www.bels.org.

BELS
BOARD OF EDITORS IN THE LIFE SCIENCES
www.bels.org

Altmetrics: A Modern Way to Assess Research and Journals

Plum Analytics

Andrea Michalek
President

Mike Buschman
Chief Product Officer

Marianne Parkhill
Director of Marketing

For decades, scholarly publishers have been using Journal Impact Factor (JIF) as a measure of quality of the journals they publish within their respective disciplines. Founded in the print world of the 1960s by Eugene Garfield, the JIF regime is based on the average number of times articles within a journal were cited during the previous two years.

Over the years, the use of the JIF expanded as a proxy for researcher impact and is still one of the main metrics used for tenure and promotion. When research was conducted in an analog world and journals were published only on paper, this metric stood alone. Now the way research is conducted has changed dramatically. There is a huge amount of scholarly communication happening online, research output is no longer confined to articles in a journal, and many more metrics are available. The notion of the journal container as proxy for impact appears less and less tenable.

Old processes die hard of course. Why is the JIF still so entrenched? From a publishing point of view, having an agreed way to measure the "quality" of journals is appealing. Journals, after all, are still the packaging in which articles are sold for the most part—even if they are bundled as part of larger packages or aggregations. And tenure and promotion committees are loathe to be the first to change established ways of measuring researchers. Over the years, researchers themselves have become socialized to the process as well. This cycle between scholarly publishers, researchers, and tenure boards has been remarkably resistant to

new measures—presumably each waiting for one of the other three legs of the stool to fall before they change. However, there are many cracks in this system.

The biggest crack is the Open Access publishing model. According to the Registry of Open Access Repositories Mandatory Archiving Policies (ROARMAP), by the end of 2013, over 240 universities and over 90 research funders had adopted open publishing mandates. Even the most profitable scholarly publishers have publicly stated that Open Access publishing is inevitable. This publishing model changes a lot of the way we think about traditional publishing, especially the notion that the journal is the most important measure of impact. The reality is that Open Access demands the need to provide authors with article-level usage metrics. Historically, librarians were the biggest customers for scholarly publishing. They did not need article-level usage statistics to make collection decisions so publishers were not pushed to provide them. However, for Open Access publishers, the "customer" is the author who often pays (usually through institutions or grant funders) the Open Access article processing fee. New usage metrics, or altmetrics, provide new insights for authors and are direct measures of the article rather than the journal. While this is important in Open Access publishing, where "mega-journals" have done away with the notion of a journal brand, it is also increasingly important to authors for all articles in all journals. This further puts the article in the

forefront and reduces the need to measure journals as a proxy.

Increasingly, researchers are seeing that publishing their findings as a scholarly article is merely one type of output. Datasets, including graphs, photographs, source code, and many, many other types, are now being hosted and interacted with by other researchers. Researchers are using blogs to quickly show results of their work or to report negative results that otherwise would not be published. Born-digital books with open review are creating new types of scholarship that include baked-in elements of peer review.

More importantly, the fact that scholarly communication as a whole is taking place online allows us to measure the "data exhaust" that simply did not exist in the analog world. For instance, many researchers save articles that are important to their work in bibliographic management systems like Mendeley or Zotero. Much communication between researchers now happens on social media in places like Facebook or Twitter. Comments and reviews are now online and harvestable.

Finally, researchers are beginning to demand that they not be measured by a journal score. A year ago more than 100 researchers published a joint statement (available at http://am.ascb.org/dora/) called DORA, or the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment, which calls for journal-level metrics to be phased out in favor of article-level measures.

Plum Analytics was founded in 2012 with the vision of bringing modern ways of measuring research impact to individuals and organizations that use and analyze research. In 2013, Plum Analytics released their first product, PlumX. PlumX is an impact dashboard that processes metrics, including altmetrics, to provide information of how research output is being utilized, interacted with, and talked about around the world. In January 2014, EBSCO Information Services acquired Plum Analytics, which operates as a wholly owned subsidiary.

Using altmetrics can provide an objective way of understanding the reach of research. PlumX tracks over a dozen different types of metrics from over 30 sources. Examples of sources of

metrics include PLOS, PubMed, WorldCat, SlideShare, figshare, Twitter, Google+, CrossRef, and Reddit, to name a few. The metrics captured are items like number of times downloaded and viewed, library holdings, bookmarked articles, social media interactions like tweets and +1s, as well as many more.

To make sense out of this fire hose of data it takes careful design and deliberate collection of the data. One thing discovered in the process of working with altmetrics is that not all metrics are created equal. For example, when someone takes the time to bookmark an article for later, known as a "capture," that is more indicative of someone actually using this research than a tweet about the same article. In fact, according to a recent article published by Tony Haile in *Time*, there is no relationship between how much content is shared via social media and the attention an average reader gives that content.[1] Haile looks further at social media and also finds that people who use content usually do not share it. This is not to say that social media metrics are not important—they are very important in understanding the promotion model for articles. Nevertheless, it does indicate that just analyzing social media falls far short of the altmetrics promise.

Therefore, PlumX classifies metrics into five categories to give authors and others meaningful

1 Haile, T. (2014, March 9). What you think you know about the web is wrong. Retrieved March 20, 2014 from http://time.com/12933/what-you-think-you-know-about-the-web-is-wrong/.

information in which to analyze impact. These categories are:

- Usage, *e.g.*, downloads
- Captures, *e.g.*, bookmarks
- Mentions, *e.g.*, blog posts
- Social Media, *e.g.*, tweets
- Citations, *e.g.*, Scopus

In this way, authors and others using these data can see usage and captures versus the social media buzz, and make interesting observations and wise decisions. Both of these measures are important, but they are different and evaluators need the opportunity to view them differently.

While altmetrics help authors understand the reach and impact of their own research, they are also helpful in understanding the research they should notice. This is especially true as researchers venture increasingly into cross-disciplinary work. According to a recent *STM Report*, "There were about 25,400 active scholarly peer-reviewed journals in early 2009, collectively publishing about 1.5 million articles a year."[2] With this much work, researchers need tools to help determine what is important. The old ways of finding important work involved looking primarily at journals deemed as high impact. However, this method will not find the current articles that are getting

attention and may be important, or research that is important but is not published yet. Altmetrics helps fill this need.

There is good news here for publishers. Altmetrics do not have to be just for authors. Since a metric dashboard such as PlumX consolidates metrics at any level, including journal or issue, publishers have unprecedented information to help manage their publications. They can now answer a series of questions including:

- How are issues performing over time?
- Are we recruiting the right authors?
- Can we tell if a discipline, journal, or author is "on the rise"?
- Are our competitors promoting their articles and authors better than we are?
- How do we provide more value to our authors?

A dawning of a new age of technology always brings new ideas that provoke debate, resistance, and angst. Yet, once embraced, a new age can also bring better ways of doing things. Altmetrics is a new way of doing things that is challenging entrenched ideas about research and scholarship. Yet, altmetrics can also be used to discover new ideas about research and help publishers with new insight about their publications.

---

2   Ware, M., Mabe, M. (2009, September). The STM report: An overview of scientific and scholarly journal publishing. Retrieved March 20, 2014 from http://www.stm-assoc.org/2009_10_13_MWC_STM_Report.pdf.

Update on RTP Local Group and Regional Coordinator Position

By Jan Higgins, PhD
gim@acmg.net
Managing Editor
Genetics in Medicine

The RTP Local Group in North Carolina has been going on for over four years now, and I wanted to update you on the current meetings. When we initially got together, it was decided we'd be a networking group and forum for discussing journal matters. We met every other month for lunch at a central restaurant in our area and talked shop.

However, at our annual meeting in 2013, a new idea was hatched with Jack Nestor, Elizabeth Blalock, and Kurt Spurlock to revamp the local group meetings. We are blessed in this area to have several companies in our industry. Three of these volunteered to "host" the new styled meetings, and to give the lunch meeting a "topic." The hope was to re-ignite the excitement about our local group, which had decreased to about 8 "regulars." We also thought we could increase the number of regular attendees by showing value to the employers of our local members by addressing topics of interest in a more formal way than we had previously.

First up in November 2013 was Keith Collier from Rubriq, a division of Research Square (http://en.researchsquare.com/) based in Durham. Keith hosted us at their new offices in the newly refurbished Durham tobacco warehouse district. Keith gave a short presentation on the future of peer review followed by an open discussion. Afterward, Research Square kindly provided a pizza lunch, and we spent the next hour networking with peers. Close to 40 people attended, and the presentation and lunch were excellent.

Our second topical meeting was in January at a local restaurant in Chapel Hill and hosted by Technica, a Chapel Hill based company (http://technicaeditorial.com/). The restaurant, Mama Dip's, was a Southern feast, with such delicacies as collard greens and chitlins on the menu! We were nearly 30 people and Jack Nestor and Arlene Furman, owners of Technica, gave a short presentation on manuscript formatting for production, and why formatting is important. Again, there were several questions and discussions followed by a networking period over lunch (the catfish gumbo was excellent!)

Our third meeting was in March, hosted by another local company in Cary, NC J&J Editorial (www.jjeditorial.com/). This lunchtime topic was ORCID, the Pros and Cons, hosted by Julie Nash, co-owner of J&J Editorial, at the Tribeca Tavern, with about 30 attendees. Michael Casp of J&J Editorial presented the pros of adopting ORCID, such as ease of ORCID registration, the ability to distinguish between authors with similar names, and linking multiple types of researcher output to one's profile. Sara Lee presented the cons, such as the ease of ORCID registration (i.e., with a name and email address, anyone can create an ORCID), and the need to establish a rapid process for corrections.

Our next meeting will be held at Research Square in Durham, Tuesday June 3, 10:30am to 12:00pm. The speaker is a friend and colleague of mine, Ann Winter-Vann, who I invited to give a short talk on the consequences of a sedentary job. After shifting from an active research position to a sedentary full-time job, Ann had to deal with the loss of physical activity that comes with a work-from-home lifestyle. Ann has developed effective strategies to integrate physical activity into her workday and on June 3rd, Ann will share her strategies with us.

We have really enjoyed our new format and hope that by sharing it with you, it might inspire you to set up a local group in your area. To that end, I have also taken on the role of the Regional Group Coordinator. In this capacity, I hope to advise members on setting up a regional group, and to assist in possible format and content for meetings. The plan is to share the successes (and things that did not work!) with other ISMTE members in the hopes that you too could have a successful local group. This article is the first step in that process, so if you are interested in setting up a local group you know who to contact!

Getting Started in Freelance Editing

By Ruth E. Thaler–Carter
www.writerruth.com

Adapted by the author from an "On the Basics" post at the An American Editor blog

My colleagues among professional editors, including members of ISMTE, probably get as tired as I do of LinkedIn discussions and direct queries asking how to get started in freelancing as an editor. It isn't that I mind helping people out; I love to. It's more that the askers can be so clueless. Although ISMTE members wouldn't fall into that category, you might benefit from some of my responses, so here goes.

I usually suggest studying one of the major style manuals — Associated Press, Chicago, American Psychological Association, Government Printing Office, etc. — because a great way to lose a prospective client is not to know what "AP," "CMOS," "APA," or "GPO" means.

Important books to get, read, and absorb, even for some ISMTE members, include *The Copyeditor's Handbook: A Guide for Book Publishing and Corporate Communications, with Exercises and Answer Keys,* by Amy Einsohn; *Copyediting: A Practical Guide*, by Karen Judd; *The Business of Editing: Effective and Efficient Ways to Think, Work, and Prosper,* by Richard Adin, edited and with a foreword and introductions by yours truly and Jack M. Lyon, with the index by Sue Nedrow (www.wakinglionpress.com/businessofediting. htm); and "Freelancing 101: Launching Your Editorial Business" a booklet I wrote for the Editorial Freelancers Association (EFA; www.the-efa. org/res/resources.php).

Be prepared to take tests to demonstrate your skills, even if you have substantial experience as an ISMTE member. Think of tests as opportunities to show your stuff and prove your worth.

To get started:

- Contact everyone you've ever worked with or for to let them know you're available for freelance work, and ask them to keep you in mind if their colleagues need an editor. Let friends and family know as well — you might be surprised at who among them either needs an editor or knows of others who do, and you can usually count on them to be your biggest cheerleaders.
- Ask those colleagues for references or testimonials that you can post to a website or use in a promotional brochure.
- Join the Editorial Freelancers Association (EFA; www.the-efa.org) and/or National Association of Independent Writers and Editors (NAIWE; www.naiwe.com) for access to job services and directory listings for members, discussion lists, courses, interaction with colleagues, and other resources.
- Set up a website. You'll need it to get found, as an easily accessible portfolio, and to establish a professional-looking, domain-based email address.
- Participate actively in LinkedIn and association environments, offering advice as well as asking for help — networking is a two-way process. (Make sure all posts in those environments are grammatically and otherwise perfect!)
- Subscribe to Rich Adin's blog (http://americaneditor.wordpress.com) to learn more about the world of publishing and the nature of both editing and freelancing. Join the Copy Editing List (www.copyediting-l.info) to plug into the insights and wisdom of some of the most knowledgeable and experienced editors around. Subscribe to *Copyediting* newsletter (www.copyeditor.com) and its related blogs to stay abreast of trends in language and the editing profession, and for access to its resources, such as a job board, courses on grammar, and other aspects of editing.

- Start saving now to attend the annual Communication Central conference for freelancers (www.communication-central.com; this year, Sept. 26–27, 2014, in Rochester, NY, with an Editorial Bootcamp on Sept. 28) to meet colleagues, learn how to make the most of important editing tools, and enhance your business and marketing skills. Many of the sessions are of value to in-house editors as well as freelancers.
- Use your imagination to develop an approach of your own. As long as it's based on good practice, ethical behavior, and. genuine skills and experience, it will serve you well.

Ruth E. Thaler-Carter (Ruth@.writerruth.com) is an award-winning freelance writer, editor, proofreader, desktop publisher, and speaker whose motto is "I can write about anything!"® She is also the owner of Communication Central, author of the "Freelance Basics" blog for the Society for Technical Communication, editor of the EFA newsletter, and the "On the Basics" contributor to Rich Adin's An American Editor blog.

Combining Scholarship and Scholarly Publishing

By Lisa Daitch
Origin Editorial

It was a sheer stroke of good fortune that led me into the world of scholarly publishing.

I was born and raised in Queens, New York, but in 1999, my husband's company offered him the opportunity to head up an office in the San Francisco Bay Area, and we decided to move from one coast to the other.

Not long after our arrival, I began to seek out work. At the time of our move, I had a great job as the Executive Secretary of a very old and well-respected stamp collectors club. That experience, combined with my earlier background as a market research field supervisor, led me to focus on finding a job as an administrative assistant.

I secured a wonderful position at the Ernest Gallo Clinic and Research Center, an institute affiliated with the University of California, San Francisco. I was administrative assistant to a few principal investigators, a couple of whom greatly appreciated my skills as a proofreader/copyeditor.

At the Gallo Center I was surrounded by lots of people with "important letters" after their names, and I began to lament the fact that I never completed my college degree. I made the decision to go back to school, and started attending classes at the local community college (Diablo Valley College) while continuing to work full time.

After a few semesters at Diablo Valley, I had completed my "general ed" and needed to move on to university. I was accepted and enrolled at California State University Hayward (now, East Bay). However, it soon became clear that it was going to take an inordinate amount of time to finish my degree while working 40 or more hours per week, but the powers that be at the Gallo Center would not allow me to cut my schedule enough to accommodate the pursuit of my education. I made the bold decision to resign, and play it by ear.

It was then that the founding director of the Gallo Center offered me the best opportunity that had ever come my way. He had recently become Editor-in-Chief of a scholarly journal, and hired me to work part time, from home (or wherever there was a computer and an Internet connection), assisting the Managing Editor, located remotely in Indiana.

That position took me through my time at university, and I graduated *cum laude* with a degree in mass communication in 2007. In 2010, my position with that journal became full time, and, late last year, I took on an additional position as a part-time Editorial Assistant with another scholarly journal.

Being in the right place at the right time, and knowing the right person, gave me my start in my career in scholarly publishing, and I couldn't be more grateful.

ISMTE Member Corner
Welcome to our newest members!

Jennifer Mahar
Origin Editorial

Sally Scholz
Hypatia

Debra Fusting
Kaufman Wills Fusting & Co Editorial Services

Martica Heaner, PhD
Wiley Blackwell Publishing, Inc.

Heather Malloy
Mary Ann Liebert, Inc.

Diane Marsh
National Council of Juvenile and Family
Court Judges

Rachel Deary
Technica Editorial

Jasmine Suarez
Technica Editorial

Letitia Glozer
Technica Editorial

Kim Fryer
Educational Testing Service (ETS)

Mary Cantrell
Technical Editor

Calendar of Events

ORCID Outreach Meeting and Codefest
May 21-22, 2014
Chicago, Illinois, USA
www.orcid.org

Society for Scholarly Publishing Annual Meeting
May 28-30, 2014
Boston, Massachusetts, USA
www.sspnet.org

Journal Metric Analysis and Measuring Impact
June 4, 2014
Oxford, England
www.alpsp.org

12th EASE General Assembly and Conference
June 13-15, 2014
Split, Croatia
http://publicationethics.org/

12th Annual Editorial User Group Meeting (EMUG)
June 19-20, 2014
Boston, Massachusetts, USA
www.editorialmanager.com

COPE North American seminar
August 13, 2014
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
http://publicationethics.org/

ISMTE North American Conference
August 14-15, 2014
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
www.ismte.org

ALPSP International Conference 2014
September 10-12, 2014
London, England
www.alpsp.org

ISMTE European Conference
October 13-14, 2014
London, England
www.ismte.org

Thank You
to our Corporate Sponsors!

Platinum Supporter

Wiley–Blackwell

Silver Supporters

**ACS Publications
American Institute of Physics
Origin Editorial
Wolters Kluwer Health**

Bronze Supporters

**Editage, eJournalPress, J & J Editorial, LLC,
Thomson Reuters**

**Interested in supporting ISMTE?
Please visit http://www.ismte.
org/?page=CorporateMembership**

ISMTE Editorial Office News

Editorial Office News (*EON*) is the official newsletter of the International Society of Managing and Technical Editors (ISMTE) and is published monthly. The contents and opinions expressed by the authors do not necessarily represent those of the Society, the Board of Directors, or *EON* Editors, nor does the publication of an article constitute an endorsement on the part of ISMTE of the authors' organizations or companies. Submissions are welcome and can be sent to the Editor at the address below. Submissions may be edited for style and format without the author's permission. Authors must seek permission to reprint any copyrighted material and provide this permission to the Editor.

EON's content belongs to the members of ISMTE. Users may view and download *EON* articles for personal, non-commercial use. Use beyond that allowed by the "Fair Use" limitations (sections 107 and 108) of the US Copyright law requires written permission from the *EON* Editor.

A note on English: ISMTE *aims to be a truly international society. English will represent our lingua franca, but we would like to stress that, in materials published in* EON *or online, variations in idiomatic usage and spelling should reflect the origins of the author. No one version of English is preferred over the other.*

Thank You to our Corporate Sponsors!

Platinum

WILEY-BLACKWELL

Silver Level

ACS Publications — MOST TRUSTED. MOST CITED. MOST READ

ORIGIN

AIP Publishing

Wolters Kluwer
Health

Bronze Level

editage by CACTUS

eJournal Press

j&j editorial, LLC
peer review management

THOMSON REUTERS