

Editorial

Making This Journal More Accessible— and More Useful

Walter Archer, University of Alberta

This is the first issue of the *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education* to be published solely online, with no printed version and no embargo period for the online version. CAUCE will save a substantial amount of money by no longer printing and mailing a paper version of the journal, funds that will be devoted to providing other services to its members. However, the main advantage of this move is that the contents of each issue will be instantly accessible to everyone with Internet access, including all CAUCE members.

With this factor in mind, I have made an effort to ensure that the content of this issue of the journal is not only more accessible but also more useful to the CAUCE membership. Some food for thought was provided in our last issue by Lorraine Carter and Tracey Taylor-O'Reilly in their Forum piece, "CAUCE Institutional Members' Survey: A Snapshot." In that survey, CJUCE was among the services that generated "High Satisfaction" among the respondents, but it was not among those that were rated as being of "High Value" (p. 33). I interpret this result as meaning that those who read the journal are generally satisfied with it, but not many CAUCE members rely on it for information and ideas that will help them do their jobs in either the short or long term.

Therefore, as of this issue, "Reports of Practice"—shorter articles written by programmers, which should contribute a wealth of ideas and information of immediate use to other programmers—will be published in CJUCE. Manuscripts submitted in this category will be peer reviewed, but different criteria will be used than those for standard academic articles. Instead of requiring a theoretical framework and an extensive review of the relevant literature, items submitted as Reports of Practice will be reviewed for relevance to the practice of university continuing education and a clear statement of ideas and practices likely to be of use to other programmers, as well as the usual requirement for clarity of expression.

Some sources of this type of item already exist. For example, as a newly hired programmer on a very steep learning curve, I found a publication called the Yearbook of Exemplary Practice, which was an annual CAUCE publication, to be particularly useful. Each yearbook contained every submission for the most recent competition for the CAUCE Program Awards, with the winners and honourable mentions in each category noted. For me, this little publication was a gold mine of good ideas from more-experienced colleagues, not only those in programming areas similar to mine but also some in quite different content areas. After 2001, CAUCE stopped

publishing the yearbook, no doubt to save costs; the winning entries in each category for the most recent competition are now mounted on the CAUCE website. However, I intend to explore the possibility of having all program award submissions, perhaps in a modified form, published in CJUCE as Reports of Practice. This, of course, will require consultation with the Program Awards Committee and the programmers who submit entries for these awards.

Presentations at CAUCE conferences are another obvious source of submissions to the new category. According to the most recent CAUCE survey, the annual conference is among the most highly valued and satisfying services provided by CAUCE (Carter & Taylor-O'Reilly, 2009, p. 33). However, although one of its most beneficial features is the wide variety of programmers who discuss aspects of their work in the many concurrent sessions, only a relatively small number of our total membership can attend a conference and even fewer members are able to attend a given conference session since, once there, they must choose among several sessions occurring in a given time slot. And yet, all of the conference presentations are important and deserve a wider audience. Traditionally, the editor of CJUCE sends a request to all conference presenters to consider expanding their presentation into an article for the journal, but few presenters do so; turning a brief presentation for an audience of practitioners into a standard academic article, with its accompanying requirements, is a major undertaking. Because the requirements for the new category are much closer to those for a presentation at a CAUCE conference (i.e., relevance to the field and immediate value to other programmers), I hope and expect that a substantial proportion of conference presenters will be willing to develop a modified version of their presentation as a Report of Practice that can be published in CJUCE. I also expect and welcome manuscripts submitted to this new category that are not built on program award submissions or conference presentations—whether a CAUCE conference or another conference.

Of course, standard research articles, book reviews, and items in our Forum category will continue to be published. The Forum category was created to include opinion pieces and other items likely to provoke further discussion, and one or more replies to a Forum piece have sometimes been published, a recent example being the replies by Gander (2008) and Nesbit (2008) to the Forum piece by McLean (2007). However, it is a rather slow way of carrying on a conversation, given there can be six months to a year between statement and reply. The new online format of CJUCE will provide ways to speed up such conversations. Although our editorial team is still learning how to take advantage of the features offered by the OJS software, we hope to use this software to make our Forum pieces, and other items, more truly interactive.

As for the contents of this issue, the article by June LeDrew and Bonnie Cummings-Vickaryous is the first to be published in our new category. It was originally submitted and reviewed as a standard research article, but due to the nature of the article and some comments from the reviewers, it was deemed to be a good candidate for inclusion in the new, more practice-oriented category. Consequently, the authors and I worked together to modify their original submission into what is now the first Report of Practice to appear in this journal.

In their report, LeDrew and Cummings-Vickaryous describe the very practical issues often faced by programmers who develop a course for distance delivery but find that some of its content is very difficult to convert to a distance format. The solution they chose—as have many other programmers—was a blended format. Their format incorporated face-to-face sessions, which involved some closely supervised physical activities, into the mainly distance, televised course, a decision that raised many practical and administrative issues. Even programmers adopting blended delivery in other contexts will find value in how the authors dealt with some of the challenges of blended delivery in their particular context.

Three research articles appear in this issue. In their article, Ruth Price and Brian Burtch discuss two programs delivered through a partnership between Simon Fraser University and the Aboriginal-operated Nicola Valley Institute of Technology located in the interior of British Columbia. The authors' thoughtful discussion of the progress and outcomes of this partnership should be of great interest to programmers contemplating or already engaged in similar partnerships.

Another important but challenging area of practice—nursing telepractice—is investigated by Lorraine Carter, Shirlene Hudyma, and Judith Horrigan in their article. Nursing, particularly telenursing, is a continually changing profession that requires high-quality continuing education that meets the actual needs of this widely dispersed group of professionals. The authors' survey provides information that will be particularly useful to those in this difficult area of practice.

Meeting the educational needs of older adults is another important and steadily expanding area of practice for university continuing educators. In this issue's final article, Atlanta Sloane-Seale and Bill Kops report on their survey of older adults' learning activities. In so doing, they shed some light on how our continuing education units can better address the needs of this rapidly growing segment of Canada's population.

We on the editorial team hope that you will approve of the new format for this issue and the new "Reports of Practice" category. If you have comments or suggestions, please email them to me at walter.archer@ualberta.ca.

REFERENCES

- Carter, L., & Taylor-O'Reilly, T. (2009). CAUCE institutional members' survey: A snapshot. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, 35(2), 29–42.
- Gander, L. (2008). About us: Reflection and dialogue on the purpose of university continuing education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, 34(1), 17–26.
- McLean, S. (2007). About us: Expressing the purpose of university continuing education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, 33(2), 65–86.
- Nesbit, T. (2008). Don't mourn, organize: A response to Scott McLean. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, 34(1), 27–36.