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Taking Stock in Our Final Year of Editorship

This October issue is the first in the final year of our editorship, which began in 2010. The years that have intervened have been both a blur and slow motion, carrying with them problems that have frustrated and confused us as well as joys and insights that have been instructive and delightful. We thought we might take this opportunity to discuss with the readers of *English Education* what we have learned from being coeditors as we embark on our final year of work on the journal.

Perhaps the first and most important thing we have learned is that we work together well. Although we do not always see eye to eye, we have similar work patterns and drives, and we have learned that we can count on each other to do our own work independently and to pick up slack for each other when overloads happen. And overloads do happen. For example, Leslie’s promotion to associate dean has required more travel to meetings and conferences, and Lisa’s shift back to the high school classroom has reduced the hours in the day she has to read and write. We manage the load of the journal by setting deadlines for ourselves and by meeting on a weekly basis through technology. We both look forward to our Sunday Skype calls not only to discuss the journal but also to share what is happening in our personal and work lives. We have both developed teaching, writing, and research ideas through these weekly talks.

Before our tenure as coeditors of *English Education*, we both had had some experience with editing. Leslie had been the first author of an edited volume (Rush, Eakle, & Berger, 2007), and Lisa had been the coeditor of *English Leadership Quarterly* with Susan Groenke. Editing *English Education*, however, has been eye opening. The process of publishing in a journal has been demystified. We are constantly (and pleasantly) amazed by the quality of the reviews provided by *English Education* reviewers. These steadfast reviewers, even though they are not members of a review board, come through
consistently with insight, clarity, and knowledge. The reviewers have made our editorial decisions rather easy because they take the time to read and provide such thorough comments for us. This means that *English Education* is truly a reader- and author-directed journal.

We are also continually surprised by the variety of submissions and submitters. In any given week we might have one manuscript submitted by a graduate student, another from someone just starting out in the profession, and another from someone well established in the field. They are all evaluated the same way and by a range of reviewers who have expertise in the topic(s). One of our favorite experiences is to have an early-career faculty member come up to us at a conference and thank us for publishing his or her article.

The quality of the submissions to the journal, along with the knowledgeable and insightful comments from reviewers, ensure we get the best professional development possible. We have the amazing opportunity to read and learn from our authors and our reviewers, such that we have begun to feel that editing the journal is like constantly attending amazing conference sessions from the comfort of our own homes. Many times we have talked about the reference section of submissions and how we need to read some of the texts authors have included in their manuscript.

This editorial is a love letter to you, the readers, authors, and reviewers of *English Education*. We have learned from you, we have enjoyed working with you, and we look forward to our final year of editing *EE*. It’s a process, a pleasure, and a ton of (gratifying) work. Thanks for the opportunity!

In this issue, we have so much to provoke your thought and engagement with all articles related to preservice English education. In their article, “Preparing Preservice Teachers to Become Teachers of Writing: A 20-Year Review of the Research Literature,” Denise N. Morgan and Kristine E. Pytash provide a comprehensive review of the literature on preparing teachers of writing, including preservice teachers’ beliefs, teaching practices, interactions with student writers, and the experiences in methods courses that are particularly influential for preservice teachers. The authors advocate for a writing-specific methods course and provide helpful suggestions—based on their review—for the content of such a course. According to Morgan and Pytash, “the findings from these collective studies highlight the crucial need for PSTs to experience methods courses that provide explicit, consistent, and thoughtful writing experiences” (p. 28).

Michelle Zoss, Teri Holbrook, Ewa McGrail, and Peggy Albers provide a study of preservice teachers’ perceptions of what it means to teach literacy in urban settings. In “Knotty Articulations: Professors and Preservice Teachers on Teaching Literacy in Urban Schools,” the authors complicate these
perceptions, examining them in light of the university instructors’ roles in and metaphors for teaching literacy. This examination, in addition to the complicated tasks taken on by preservice teachers in examining their own metaphors and the metaphors prevalent in schools and communities, presents both thrilling and disturbing possibilities. As Zoss et al. suggest, “If context matters, then what we contributed to that context through words spoken and written in course materials and class sessions also matters. Namely, we were complicit in sanctioning certain kinds of understandings about teacher, urban, and literacy” (p. 68). Although these authors name their own complicity in developing the understandings of students, they also provide suggestions for university instructors who wish to seek opportunities for development of inquiring attitudes in preservice teachers in regard to literacy, urban contexts, and urban teaching.

Finally, in “Extending the Conversation: Contemplating Trust in Times of Uncertainty: Uniting Practice and Interactional Awareness to Address Ethical Dilemmas in English Teacher Education,” Melinda J. McBee Orzulak, Danielle Lillge, Steven John Engel, and Victoria Shaw Haviland address the age-old problem of theory and practice in the perceptions of English preservice teachers and the teacher educators who wish to best prepare them for school settings. This powerful reflection examines a perennially plaguing question: “In three short semesters, we wondered, is it possible to do more than plant the seeds of interactional awareness?” (p. 87) and describes the development of a lesson architecture that has allowed these teacher educators to name specific practices, to connect those practices to theory, and to explain how practices can be matched to specific students and contexts. We fully expect that these three articles will raise questions, engender inquiry, and improve our practice as we seek to prepare the next generation of English teachers.
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