

**Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
May 11–13, 2016
Chicago, Illinois**

***American Archivist* Editorial Board
Report: November 1, 2015 – March 31, 2016
(Prepared by Gregory S. Hunter)**

Allen Press

We have completed the move of *The American Archivist* to an online platform hosted by Allen Press. Feedback from members and subscribers has been very positive.

We also have completed the second phase of the transition, the move of production and printing to Allen Press. Volume 78, No. 2 (Fall/Winter 2015) was the first issue produced by Allen Press. Based upon our experiences with this issue, we have revised some internal journal deadlines and processes. We will look at these items again after we complete the next issue of the journal.

The next phase of the transition will involve implementing manuscript tracking and review through the Allen Press platform. After training and testing in the near future, we plan to have this fully operational by the time of the SAA Annual Meeting.

Upcoming Issue

Volume 79, No. 1 (Spring/Summer 2016) is in production. It contains the Presidential Address, Pease Award, 8 other articles and 5 book reviews. Two of the articles comprise a special section on “Digitizing Archives.”

Article Statistics 2013-2015

When I became editor of *The American Archivist*, I changed the categories of publication decisions to provide more transparency and clearer guidance to authors. The new categories are: accept, revise and resubmit, and reject. I now have three years of statistics for the new categories.

I received a total of 24 new articles in 2015, not counting the articles with guaranteed publication (Presidential Address and Pease Award). Listed below is the disposition of the new 2015 articles and a comparison to the previous years:

Response	2013 Number	2013 Percent	2014 Number	2014 Percent	2015 Number	2015 Percent
Accept	5	14%	5	19%	7	29%

Revise and Resubmit	31	86%	17	62%	11	46%
Reject	0	0%	5	19%	6	25%
Total	36	100%	27	100%	24	100%

As peer reviewers and I have become more familiar with the new categories, we have seen a decrease in the number of articles initially receiving a “revise and resubmit” decision. Of course, the relatively small number of articles does mean that percentages can vary widely from year to year.

Since the “revise and resubmit” category is the largest, I am providing additional analysis. The disposition of these articles was as follows:

Category	2013 Number	2013 Percent	2014 Number	2014 Percent	2015 Number	2015 Percent
Withdrawn/Rejected	1	3%	0	0%	2	18%
Resubmitted and Accepted	19	61%	4	24%	2	18%
Not Yet Resubmitted	11	36%	13	76%	7	64%
Total	31	100%	17	100%	11	100%

The “revise and resubmit” process is a rigorous one. The author receives anonymized versions of all three peer reviews. The author then develops a revision plan for addressing concerns raised during the peer review process. If an article is resubmitted, I compare it to the original peer reviews and the revision plan in reaching a final decision about publication. Some articles are resubmitted more than once.

In the table below, I summarize the final decisions on all articles.

Category	2013 Number	2013 Percent	2014 Number	2014 Percent	2015 Number	2015 Percent
Accepted	24	66%	12	44%	9	37%
Rejected/Withdrawn	1	3%	8	30%	8	34%
Not Yet Resubmitted	11	31%	7	26%	7	29%
Total	36	100%	27	100%	24	100%

It is important to note that some articles are not resubmitted until the following year. In this report, I adjusted the 2014 statistics reported to Council last year. The same will happen next year with the 2015 statistics.

Conclusion

I would be happy to answer any questions Council may have about the Editorial Board or *The American Archivist*. Thank you again for your support of the journal.