

EDITORIAL

Contributing a Commentary to *JUME*: *Keeping Things Going While They Are Still Stirring*

David W. Stinson
Georgia State University

As *JUME* continues to grow in both years and influence, I have had an increasing number of mathematics educators (i.e., scholars, researchers, teacher educators, and/or classroom teachers) inquire about contributing a manuscript to the Commentary or Response Commentary sections of the journal. Some of the usual questions: Can anyone submit a manuscript for consideration to these sections? Or are manuscripts by invitation? Are manuscripts peer reviewed? What is the turnaround time? What issues or topics might be included? How long is a typical manuscript? What is the purpose (or purposes) of a *JUME* commentary? Here, I aim to answer these and other questions (see highlighted hyperlinks throughout for additional information).

I begin by responding to the last question, given that the subtitle of this editorial—a paraphrase of Sojourner Truth’s words spoken at the first annual meeting of the American Equal Rights Association in 1867—reflects the purpose of a *JUME* commentary. Her extended remarks certainly convey, I believe, the purpose: “So I am for keeping the thing going while things are stirring; because if we wait till it is still, it will take a great while to get it going again” (Truth, 1867, p. 20). That is to say, the purpose of the Commentary section—and its companion, the Response Commentary section¹—is to keep conversations about critical issues going in constructive directions, forever bringing those critical issues into the center.² When stirring, not only do things keep going but also those things on the margins are brought to the center. A perusal of the titles of *JUME* commentaries over the past 9 years provides a listing of sorts of some of the critical issues that need to be contin-

¹ Manuscripts submitted to the Response Commentary section should be in **direct response** to commentaries published in *JUME*, either in the current issue or past issues. These response commentaries can provide a different viewpoint, extend the conversation, or take the conversation in a new direction.

² When bringing critical issues to the center, the aim is not to somehow normalize such issues but rather to include them as central components of productive discussions and actions.

DAVID W. STINSON is an associate professor of mathematics education in the Department of Middle and Secondary Education in the College of Education and Human Development, at Georgia State University, P.O. Box 3978, Atlanta, GA, 30303; e-mail: dstinson@gsu.edu. His research interests include exploring socio-cultural, -historical, and -political aspects of mathematics and mathematics teaching and learning from a critical postmodern theoretical (and methodological) perspective. He is a co-founder and current editor in chief of the *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education*.

uously engaged and brought to the center (see Appendix A).

Because many, if not most, of these issues can be perceived as troubling and uncomfortable topics for “polite conversation,” too often the way they are discussed or “managed” in the larger mathematics education community is through journal special editions; set-aside meetings, conferences, workshops, or courses; or themed edited volumes, to name just a few. In other words, rarely are these issues integrated throughout the day-to-day discussions and activities of the vast majority of mathematics educators.

But here at *JUME* these too-uncomfortable-for-polite-conversation issues are the very ones that are openly integrated and, most importantly, interrogated throughout the online pages of every *JUME* edition. In many ways, the commentary (or commentaries) of each published edition sets the stage, so to speak, to remind our readers about the journal’s mission: “To foster a transformative global academic space in mathematics that embraces critical research, emancipatory pedagogy, and scholarship of engagement in urban communities.”

Can anyone submit a manuscript for consideration to these sections? Or are manuscripts by invitation? The responses to these two questions: yes and yes. Submitted manuscripts to the Commentary and Response Commentary sections are both unsolicited and solicited.³ But it is crucial to note, whether unsolicited or solicited, manuscripts must be *scholarly* essays solidly grounded in the literature. Manuscripts are not to be confused with blog postings, letters to the editor, or op-eds. Similar to these writing spaces, authors are encouraged to submit manuscripts in first-person narratives but these narratives must be grounded in the science of the author(s), the science of others, or, preferably, both. In fact, when manuscripts are solicited, we (the Editorial Team) request that the author(s) cite heavily her or his own work and the work of others so that the reference list might become an educative resource for our readers. Most often, solicited authors are noted senior scholars who have an extensive and established body of research and scholarship that reflects the mission of *JUME*. Nonetheless, throughout the past 9 years, commentaries have been authored and co-authored not only by senior scholars but also by mid-career folks, freshly minted PhDs, and doctoral students.

Are manuscripts peer reviewed? What is the turnaround time? Yes, all manuscripts submitted to both the Commentary and the Response Commentary sections are open peer reviewed⁴ by the editor and members of the editorial team (and, at times, other senior members of the larger mathematics education community). Ini-

³ Solicited manuscripts might also include revised versions of delivered talks (see, e.g., Leonard, 2012; Martin, 2015; Nasir, 2016); the aim here is to bring unpublished talks to the larger mathematics education community.

⁴ Submissions to the Public Stories of Mathematics Educators and the Book Review sections are also open peer reviewed by the editor and members of the editorial team.

tially, manuscripts were sent out for double-blind peer review. The process was changed to open peer review so that solicited authors might receive reviews in a timely manner. Given that the journal is published only twice a year, it was important that time from initial solicitation to published commentary be no more than six months. In most cases, for both unsolicited and solicited submitted manuscripts, authors receive reviews within eight to ten weeks, with time from initial submission to publication being around six to eight months. (See [Peer Review Process](#) for additional information.)

What issues or topics might be included? How long is a typical manuscript? The issues or topics of submitted manuscripts vary widely. To provide an idea of what might be addressed in a *JUME* commentary, I borrow partially from Kilpatrick (2007) when he provided a list on what topics might be included in a manuscript submitted to the Research Commentary section of the *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*. I modify and extend his list here to focus explicitly on an *urban* mathematics education context:

- Commentaries on research within an urban context;
- Discussions of the connections between research, policy, and/or practice within an urban context;
- Scholarly analyses of policy trends related to urban mathematics education (e.g., research funding, national policies);
- Scholarly essays on sociopolitical issues that relate to urban mathematics education;
- Commentaries on the relationship between research and evaluation within an urban context; and
- Scholarly debates among proponents of different viewpoints on issues that relate to urban mathematics education.

This list is certainly not exhaustive, but does provide an idea of the different possible directions a *JUME* commentary might take (for additional guidance, see Appendix A). The length of manuscripts typically range from 1,500–4,500 words, inclusive of references, appendices, footnotes, figures, and tables. (See [Section Policies](#) and [Author Guidelines](#) for additional information about submitting a manuscript to *JUME*.)

With the aim of *keeping things going while they are still stirring*, we look forward to receiving your submission to the Commentary or Response Commentary sections. If you have additional questions, please email me at dstinson@gsu.edu.

References

- Kilpatrick, J. (2007). A commentary on research commentaries [Editorial]. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 38(2), 106–107.

- Leonard, J. (2012). Er'body talkin' 'bout social justice ain't goin' there. *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education*, 5(2), 18–27.
Retrieved from <http://ed-osprey.gsu.edu/ojs/index.php/JUME/article/view/192/117>
- Martin, D. B. (2015). The collective Black and *Principles to Actions*. *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education*, 8(1), 17–23.
Retrieved from <http://ed-osprey.gsu.edu/ojs/index.php/JUME/article/view/270/169>
- Nasir, N. S. (2016). Why mathematics educators should care about race and culture? *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education*, 9(1), 6–17.
Retrieved from <http://ed-osprey.gsu.edu/ojs/index.php/JUME/article/view/298/192>
- Truth, S. (1867). Speech, *Proceedings of the first anniversary of the American Equal Rights Association, held at the Church of the Puritans, New York, May 9 and 10, 1867* (pp. 20–21). New York, NY: R. J. Johnston, Printer.

APPENDIX A

- Commentaries and ♦ Response Commentaries by Title and Author (2008–2016)

NOTE: Scroll over titles and click; all are hyperlinked.

- Putting the “Urban” in Mathematics Education Scholarship
William F. Tate – *Washington University in St. Louis*
- The Common Core State Standards Initiative: A Critical Response
Eric (Rico) Gutstein – *University of Illinois at Chicago*
- Mathematics as Gatekeeper: Power and Privilege in the Production of Knowledge
Danny Bernard Martin, Maisie L. Gholson – *University of Illinois at Chicago*
Jacqueline Leonard – *University of Colorado Denver*
 - ♦ “Both And”—Equity and Mathematics: A Response to Martin, Gholson, and Leonard
Jere Confrey – *North Carolina State University*
 - ♦ Engaging Students in Meaningful Mathematics Learning: Different Perspectives, Complementary Goals
Michael T. Battista – *The Ohio State University*
- Changing Students’ Lives Through the De-tracking of Urban Mathematics Classrooms
Jo Boaler – *Stanford University*
- Positive Possibilities of Rethinking (Urban) Mathematics Education Within a Postmodern Frame
Margaret Walshaw – *Massey University*
- Neoliberal Urbanism, Race, and Equity in Mathematics Education
Pauline Lipman – *University of Illinois at Chicago*
- Erbody Talkin bout Social Justice Aint Goin There
Jacqueline Leonard – *University of Wyoming*
- Why (Urban) Mathematics Teachers Need Political Knowledge
Rochelle Gutiérrez – *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*
- Place Matters: Mathematics Education Reform in Urban Schools
Celia Rousseau Anderson – *University of Memphis*
- Why Should Mathematics Educators Learn from and about Latina/o Students’ In-School and Out-of-School Experiences?
Marta Civil – *The University of Arizona*

- The Collective Black and *Principles to Actions*
Danny Bernard Martin – *University of Illinois at Chicago*
 - ♦ Call for Mathematics Education Colleagues and Stakeholders to Collaboratively Engage with NCTM: In Response to Martin’s Commentary
Diane J. Briars – *NCTM President*
Matt Larson – *NCTM President-Elect*
Marilyn E. Strutchens – *NCTM Board of Directors*
David Barnes – *NCTM Associate Executive Director, Research, Learning and Development*
- Mathematics and Social Justice: A Symbiotic Pedagogy
Gareth Bond, Egan J. Chernoff – *University of Saskatchewan, Canada*
- From Implicit to Explicit: Articulating Equitable Learning Trajectories Based Instruction
Marrielle Myers – *Kennesaw State University*
Paola Sztajn – *North Carolina State University*
P. Holt Wilson – *University of North Carolina at Greensboro*
Cyndi Edgington – *North Carolina State University*
- Why Should Mathematics Educators Care About Race and Culture?
Na’ilah Suad Nasir – *University of California, Berkeley*