

**Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
May 16–17, 2017
Chicago, Illinois**

***American Archivist* Editorial Board
Report: November 1, 2016 – April 30, 2017
(Prepared by Gregory S. Hunter)**

Article Statistics 2013-2016

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 four years of statistics for the new categories.

I received a total of twenty-eight new articles in 2016, not counting the articles with guaranteed publication (Presidential Address and Pease Award). This is an increase of four articles from 2015. Listed below is the disposition of the new 2016 articles and a comparison to the previous three years:

Response	2013 Number	2013 Percent	2014 Number	2014 Percent	2015 Number	2015 Percent	2016 Number	2016 Percent
Accept	5	14%	5	19%	7	29%	8	29%
Revise and Resubmit	31	86%	17	62%	11	46%	16	57%
Reject	0	0%	5	19%	6	25%	4	14%
Total	36	100%	27	100%	24	100%	28	100%

For the last three years, the percentages have remained relatively constant. Approximately one-third of articles are accepted and two-thirds require the author to revise and resubmit. The rejection rate has been between fifteen and twenty-five percent.

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

Category	2013 Number	2013 Percent	2014 Number	2014 Percent	2015 Number	2015 Percent	2016 Number	2016 Percent
Withdrawn/Rejected	1	3%	0	0%	2	18%	1	6%
Resubmitted and Accepted	19	61%	4	24%	2	18%	6	38%
Not Yet Resubmitted	11	36%	13	76%	7	64%	9	56%
Total	31	100%	17	100%	11	100%	16	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 for the last four years.

Category	2013 Number	2013 Percent	2014 Number	2014 Percent	2015 Number	2015 Percent	2016 Number	2016 Percent
Accepted	24	66%	12	44%	12	50%	14	50%
Rejected/ Withdrawn	1	3%	8	30%	9	38%	5	18%
Not Yet Resubmitted	11	31%	7	26%	3	12%	9	32%
Total	36	100%	27	100%	24	100%	28	100%

It is important to note that some articles are not resubmitted until the following year. In this report, I adjusted slightly the 2015 statistics reported to the Council last year.

Allen Press

During this reporting period, SAA implemented manuscript tracking and peer review through the Allen Press platform. While tracking and review have gone relatively smoothly, this has not been the case with issuing decisions to authors.

Key to the transparent peer review process I implemented as editor is the return of anonymized peer review rubrics and comments to authors. From the start, Peer Track did not handle this functionality correctly. I have been working with Allen Press for months trying to resolve this situation. However, in order to issue decisions to authors I finally had to print, manually redact, and then scan the completed peer review rubrics. I will continue working with Allen Press so that this and any remaining issues are resolved before the end of my term as editor.

Upcoming Issue

Volume 80, No. 1 (Spring/Summer 2017) is in production. It contains the Presidential Address, Pease Award, 8 other articles and 8 book reviews. One of the articles is the beginning of a new section, “Archives in Translation.” This inaugural article makes accessible to English-speaking archivists a key 1927 article from the Polish archival literature.

Reviews Section

As noted above, Reviews Editor Bethany Anderson has been expanding print and online reviews, both in type and number. Reviews are important for the archival profession; I have been pleased to be able to expand the pages in the journal devoted to reviews.

Intern

This year we have had the assistance of an intern, Dana Bronson. To date, she has compiled lists of presidential addresses and Pease Award winning essays published in the journal. She also has identified articles that mentioned funding from NHPRC and NEH. Dana next will begin the

major task of indexing “dark content” grouped together in sections of the journal (front matter, shorter features, international scene, etc.)

Conclusion

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