Editorial

Letter From the Editor

The timing of issue 43(1) coincides with a couple developments I am excited to share. First, the Journal has just issued a call for papers for a special issue on *Experiential Education in PK-12 and Teacher Education*, to be published in March, 2021. The guest editors—Jocelyn Glazier, Cheryl Bolick, and Annie Jonas—are keen to gather articles representing the latest thinking on this important topic. Please see the call for papers on page 108 of this issue for details. Second, the *Journal of Experiential Education* is now ranked in SCOPUS, complete with a cite score. You can visit: https://www.scopus.com/sources.uri to search for the JEE’s Scopus profile. Many authors have been asking about this and I am pleased to report this outcome.

The first article of issue 43(1), by Ovidiu Cocieru, Matthew Katz, and Mark McDonald reports on a study of *Classroom as Organization (CAO)*, which is an experiential simulation used in business classes. The study is notable not only for the insights it provides into CAO, but also for the methodology employed—network analysis—and its implications for other experiential units in university (or other) coursework. Building favorable peer networks in groups or classes is a main principle in experiential programming, yet it isn’t often the object of research. This article provides some insights and methods that hopefully spur interest in this compelling area.

The second article, *Disruptive Experiences as Tools for Teacher Education: Unearthing the Potential of Experiential Education* by Cheryl Bolick, Jocelyn Glazier, and Christoph Stutts, focuses on an immersive teacher residency program. I am familiar with Bolick, Glazier, and colleagues’ work from past JEE articles and numerous conference presentations, and this article follows on their interest in the boundary between formal and nonformal educational spaces. It especially won’t disappoint readers hopeful that the next generation of teacher candidates are receiving training in high-quality experiential education, and reflecting on its implications for their future practice.

Next, John Bennion, Brian Q. Cannon, Brian Hill, Riley Nelson, and Meagan Ricks discuss the idea of “threshold concepts” in their article on the use of reflective essays for student assessment in experiential coursework. I was excited to see this submission come into the JEE inbox because assessment is notoriously difficult to conceptualize, let alone do, in experiential classes or units. This is especially true in standards-based environments. The study reported here, however, provides both an intriguing idea and a documented method for approaching assessment particularly with disciplinary standards in mind. It would be great to see the idea pursued further in additional research on different subject areas or grade levels—there simply isn’t enough research out there on how to assess learning in experiential education, and this article makes a notable contribution.
Melissa A. Collins, Joanna Totino, Ardice Hartry, Valeria F. Romero, Rosio Pedroso, and Rosalinda Nava write on *Service learning as a lever to support STEM engagement for underrepresented youth*. This is a critical area—both in the use of service learning to support engagement among underserved students, and to assess the kinds of outcomes that might open pathways to STEM careers among underrepresented groups. The article suggests some compelling implications both for research and practice, and hopefully catalyzes future programming and research in this important area.

In *Workplace fatigue within summer camp: Perspectives From camp health care providers and directors*, Alexsandra Dubin, Barry Garst, Tracey Gaslin, and Beth Schultz discuss their research on an important but somewhat neglected topic in summer camps: employee fatigue. Summer camps not only serve many, many youth, they employ a substantial number of young adults who work in intensive conditions as they care for children and adolescents. As a longtime camper, former camp counselor, and now parent to three daughters who attend (and love) summer camp, I commend the authors for conducting this valuable exploratory study and I hope it gets the attention it deserves from practitioners and researchers alike. Summer camp should be as safe and as developmental as possible, and as anyone familiar with camp knows, the enthusiasm, attentiveness, and preparedness of the staff is one of the main factors toward success.

Finally, Kathryn Riley enjoins readers to consider outdoor educators’ ethical responsibilities in what has become known as the Anthropocene, a period wherein the earth is impacted by human activity above all else. Finding fault not only with existing programmatic emphases but also with the language and concepts used to understand human–nature relationships, Riley offers a provocative challenge to outdoor educators who favor mechanistic, input–output approaches to programming and research. The article discusses some of the possibilities of taking a post-humanist and postcolonial perspective on outdoor education, which opens new ways of understanding and approaching scholarship and practice.

One final point of order: on page 102, please note the corrigendum to a 2008 article entitled *Healthy camps: Initial lessons on illnesses and injuries from a longitudinal study* (https://doi.org/10.1177/105382590703000309). The lead author was erroneously listed as “Barry Barst.” It should read “Barry Garst.”

Many thanks for the authors, reviewers, Editorial staff, and readers who make the *JEE* the leading outlet for research on experiential education.

Sincerely,
Jayson Seaman
University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, USA