

Society of American Archivists
American Archivist Editorial Board
Virtual Meeting | April 9, 2025

MINUTES

In attendance: Amy Cooper Cary (*American Archivist* Editor and Editorial Board Chair); Rose Buchanan and Stephanie Luke (Reviews Editor); Natalia Fernandez, Shirley Franco, Amanda Greenwood, Rebecca Hankins, Marlee Newman, Jordon Steele, and Bradley Wiles; Stacie Williams (Publications Editor); and SAA staff Hannah Stryker and Savannah Tiffany

Unable to attend: Joyce Gabiola (Council Liaison); James Lowry, Sawyer Magnus, María Matienzo, and Sammie Morris

I. Brief updates:

- 88.1 – in copyediting stage
- Cooper Cary is working through the Special Section on Accessioning. It is entering the copyediting stage.
- 88.2 (first of our submissions window) – out of peer review, with editor
 - We received twenty submissions- everything that has gone out to the Board should be the last of it. Cooper Cary gathered comments and sent suggested edits
 - Accepted five, May 30 is the deadline for second revisions from authors.
- Board members are wondering if there is a way to see how long an article is before they accept it for review. Cooper Cary can ask for this information from the authors and check with PeerTrack. Cooper Cary will let the Board know about straggler articles coming through.
- 89.1 (second [submissions window](#)) – please share. The deadline for submissions is July 15. This will be featured in *In the Loop*.
- The Pease Award received 4 submissions. The committee had a discussion on April 22.
- The Hidden Content analysis is complete and moving into next steps. Kudos to Amanda Greenwood!
 - [Spreadsheet](#)
 - Greenwood discusses the notes section and the interesting tidbits within past issues; some are truly a product of their time.
 - Some notable sections: international scene, technical notes, religious archives
 - The goal is to pull this information out and highlight it in the Journal.

II. Update from Rose/Steph re: Intergenerational Conversations 3 (IG3)

- Year 2 on Presidential Addresses is being wrapped up.
 - [Shirley Franco's review](#) is the most recent in this iteration.
- The third iteration will explore content from the mid-80s to early 2000s around social justice and memory. The Reviews Editors will be identifying folks to reach out to. It will kick off in the fall based on schedules.

III. Items for Conversation:

- Revisit the AI Statement – [Feedback document gives your comments](#) – thanks to Hannah for compiling! Changes to make? Would anyone like to work on this?
 - No one has disclosed using AI in any work this year- yay!
 - If we want to add a check box for this on PeerTrack, we will have to ask IT team at KnowledgeWorks Global.
 - Stephanie Luke and Marlee Newman will be assisting Cooper Cary with a new draft of the statement.
 - Should we try to figure out a way to address how Microsoft and other systems/software are implementing AI? Should we recognize the pervasiveness with these tools? We can try to add this to Norms and Expectations.
 - There will be a revision for the Board to review at our July meeting.
- Keywords / Controlled vocabulary – Now that the Hidden Content analysis is complete, we’re considering ways to possibly engage an Early Career member for the Board. We are working on [Classifications](#) (this hasn’t slipped through the cracks!) but this is not a project for an Early Career member. We had the thought of having an Early Career member start working on keywords in the Journal:
 - Keywords are author-generated and are not consistent. Each article has different keywords, but there is no controlled vocabulary.
 - The project could engage one or two Early Career members to do a review of a certain number of years of the Journal and create a spreadsheet for keywords used; perhaps, 1985–present.
 - This could help us work with the Dictionary Working Group to create not only Classifications, but to work on a controlled vocabulary.
 - This does not come without a cost; we would have to follow up on it.
 - Free-text searching may make this superfluous.
 - With the tools that we have for searching across platforms, is this necessary?
 - What is the purpose? Is it to cluster together in a more searchable way? What are some of the benefits of giving authors and readers a controlled vocabulary? It could be a good way to view trends and facilitate research about the Journal.
 - We are constantly adding new terms, so it seems like the upkeep would be a lot of work.
 - “Is the juice worth the squeeze?”
 - The Board is not convinced this is currently necessary. We have put it on hold.

If you have project ideas for Early Career members, let Cooper Cary know.

Announcement: The next Board meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 16 at 11 am CT. It will be on Webex. RSVP page TK.

TO DO #1 (Cooper Cary): Finalize language for opt-in on reviewer identity in Editorial Manager to share with the Board; send to SAA staff for implementation.

TO DO #2 (Cooper Cary): Cooper Cary will connect with members to create a bibliography about what's been written about the Journal's and SAA's history.

TO DO #3 (Cooper Cary): Review formatting of the rubric so that visual clues encourage explanation rather than brief comments and write an introduction for the rubric which stresses the purpose and value of the responses, especially for reviewers not on the Board. Board members can send examples of other good rubrics or suggestions for additional/revised questions to Cooper Cary.

TO DO #4 (Cooper Cary and the Dictionary Working Group): Review classifications and add to the Classifications Revisions spreadsheet:
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1wid6tZeyyyaTZFa5byAZqtPk1d5IrwIRmwf1Q4AdoSU/edit?gid=0#gid=0>.

TO DO #5 (Cooper Cary, Greenwood, and Newman) Revise the Generative AI Statement before July meeting.