

Society of American Archivists
American Archivist Editorial Board
Virtual Meeting | February 15, 2024

MINUTES

In attendance: Amy Cooper Cary (*American Archivist* Editor and Editorial Board Chair); Rose Buchanan and Stephanie Luke (Reviews Editors); Natalia Fernandez, Shirley Franco, Amanda Greenwood, Rebecca Hankins, Eric Hung, María Matienzo, Jordon Steele; Bree'ya Brown and Karina Wilhelm (early-career members); and SAA staff Julia Pillard, Hannah Stryker, and Savannah Tiffany

Unable to attend: Marlee Newman and Sylvia Welsh; Stacie Williams (Publications Editor); and Joyce Gabiola (Council Liaison)

I. WELCOME – Amy Cooper Cary

- a. New SAA Assistant Director of Publications Savannah Tiffany welcomes herself and Board members take turns introducing themselves.

II. Any Updates from Council – Joyce Gabiola

- a. There are no new updates.

III. Final conversation about [ChatGPT statement](#) including feedback from the Council meeting and how to make people aware of this.

- a. Council received the statement at their February meeting. They suggested one more revision and asked that the Board includes an example. The Board has used the example of the Reviews Portal piece that was submitted with AI use to explain why we need a statement. It is important to note that we are not telling people not to use it, we just need to know if it's being used.
- b. The day of this meeting, February 15, 2024, was determined to be the adoption date of the statement.
- c. Now, the Board's mission is to make people aware of the statement. It will need to be put on the *American Archivist* homepage as well as the Reviews Portal. We will put it on Editorial Manager so peer reviewers can read it.

IV. List of Subject Areas – Discuss the purpose of classifications

- a. Classification descriptions are how reviewers identify their areas of expertise when they sign up in Editorial Manager. There are currently forty-eight classifications. These classifications were created in 2008 and have not been updated.
- b. As a Board, we need to think about how these are used and what recommendations we can make for peer reviewers to use them. The list is old, and there may be classifications missing or overrepresented. We want to make sure the list is representative and inclusive of our readership and other countries (DEIA).
- c. A group of four (Brown, Franco, Hung, and Steele) will review the classifications and make recommendations for restructuring it. They will look at other journals for

inspiration. A new list will be brought to the Board for discussion and then brought to Council at their fall meeting.

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, Hung, Lacher-Feldman, and Matienzo): 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, Stryker, and Tiffany): Work with Meridian Allen Press to get ChatGPT statement uploaded where needed.

TO DO #5 (Brown, Franco, Hung, and Steele): Review classifications in Editorial Manager system. Board members will prepare for Board review and have new classifications sheet before the fall Council meeting.