

**Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
June 8 – 10, 2012
Chicago, Illinois**

***The American Archivist* Editorial Board
Report: January 1 to May 17, 2012
(Prepared by: Journal Editor Gregory S. Hunter)**

Transition of Editor

Mary Jo Pugh transferred responsibility for the journal on January 1. SAA and the entire archival profession are in her debt. *The American Archivist* is a strong, well-respected journal with several new initiatives already under way. It is an honor to succeed Mary Jo as editor.

The transfer of files, in electronic form, went very smoothly. Copies of all files were also transferred to the SAA office, which sent them to the SAA Archives in April.

Volume 75, No. 1 (Spring/Summer 2012)

Marked-up first page proofs were returned to the SAA office in May. The issue is 261 pages in length and projected to be available in June.

Review Process

Since January 1, a total of 19 articles have been received and submitted for peer review. The reviews should be returned in the next two weeks, after which I will be able to make decisions on the papers.

During this review cycle, I am piloting a rubric with the reviewers. The Editorial Board worked through several drafts of the rubric prior to the pilot project, delaying slightly the peer review of current submissions. My goal is to make the review process more transparent to authors as well as to peer reviewers. Once we finalize the rubric, we will make it available on the SAA website for prospective authors.

At my request, the Editorial Board also modified the categories of review decisions. I found the category of “accept pending revisions” to be unclear. The new decision categories are:

- *Accept*: The article is acceptable for publication. Minor corrections may be needed.
- *Revise and Resubmit*: The article is not acceptable as submitted. Encourage the author to revise and resubmit.
- *Reject*: The article does not merit publication.

I have also begun looking at software systems to support manuscript receipt, tracking, and review. Most peer-reviewed journals use such software, which also supports my goal of making the peer review process more transparent. The Editorial Board plans to make a recommendation about this software at its August meeting. (The staff-proposed budget for FY 2013 includes \$1,000 for manuscript tracking software.)

Other Editorial Board Matters

The Editorial Board met February 20–March 1 in Chicago. I wish to thank the SAA Council for budgeting the money for the new editor to meet with the Board. We accomplished a great deal, as documented in the minutes of the meeting. Among the highlights were:

- We continue to explore online delivery, including eBook formats.
- Discussions continue about the redesign of the journal, including a switch from footnotes to endnotes. This discussion will be informed by experiments with eBook formats.
- There will be several activities to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the journal.
- There again will be a “brown bag” reading group at the SAA Annual Meeting. The discussion will be based upon an article accepted for a forthcoming issue of the journal.
- We will eliminate article type designations in the table of contents and at the beginning of each section within the journal. The editorial policy will continue to describe the different types of articles in the journal (e.g., research, case studies, perspectives, etc.), but the journal will no longer include the designations in the table of contents.

I would be happy to answer any questions that the Council may have about the Editorial Board or *The American Archivist*.