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**Reviewer 1**

While this work is potentially very interesting, I'm not convinced that it is necessary. It doesn't seem to add anything new to the conversation. The proposal would be strengthened by narrowing the selection of Fleckner's articles and having full chapter responses rather than short responses.

This proposal doesn't seem to be adding anything new to the archival literature beyond pulling Fleckner's works into one volume with minimal responses from current archivists.

Both Rand and John are outstanding writers and established scholars.

Contributors are yet to be identified and so I really can't comment on qualifications.

Final article list needs to be developed for the final proposal

Revise and resubmit

The proposal needs to do a better job making clear why this work is important and how it moves the work of SAA's publications office forward. The proposal would be strengthened if it provided more space for response from current archivists to fewer of Fleckner's articles. A final list of articles should be selected for a more complete proposal.

I think it is good to reflect on some of these issues that Fleckner brought up in the past including sustainability, archival practices, and acquisitions. These are still very much part of our professional discourse.

**Reviewer 2**

As far as I know, this is a unique contribution. I am not aware of another group of essays by one author with contributions and reflections from other authors. I think it gives readers the opportunity to see how the discourse has changed over time.

This is not applicable because the proposal does not state if the book is intended for either series.

Fleckner has a breadth of work as referenced in his proposal.

I would like to see more documentation on how the contributors will be selected for this process. The call for contributors is included but I want to know how they will be selected (will there be a rubric?), how they will be compensated, who will choose the contributors and how they will make sure they are choosing a diverse group of writers. How much time will be given for the contributors to write their essays and who will edit them, Fleckner or another editor? I think since some of these articles are decades old, if this volume is going to ask the next generation of archivists to grapple with these writings, then it needs to transparent about the work of the next generation.

As stated above, I think this proposal could use more information about the process of selecting contributors for this volume.

I think this volume would be appealing to SAA members, archivists, and archives students especially with the inclusion of new and upcoming archival writers.

I think there is an appeal to museum staff and historians who are interested in the inner workings of museum workplaces and the issues that affect them.

I think that this proposal encourages nurturing new and veteran voices by including both.

This proposal supports innovation, collaboration, and transparency of the profession. I think it can do these things well if the contributors are selected with transparency and care.

Accept with minor revisions (specify below if not noted above)

**Reviewer 3**

Both John Fleckner and Rand Jimerson have an admirable track record of peer-reviewed publications and professional involvement.

This is unclear at this stage, as they have not been identified.

The proposal is currently incomplete, as there are no contributors listed, nor is the article list narrowed down the final grouping.

I think much of this depends on the final article list, and what/who will be commenting on them, so it's difficult to make this assessment at this stage in the process.

Revise and resubmit

This proposal has advanced since it was originally submitted a few years ago, and I like the expansion into a clear discussion between more seasoned and newer generation archivists on core topics in the archival profession. I also like the idea of this being used as a tool for ongoing discussion in an online format. That being said, I wonder why or if it's necessary to restrict the older articles to those only authored by John Fleckner. While he is absolutely a bastion in the archival profession, wouldn't there be other voices we can also hear from in the archival profession, in addition to his?

**Reviewer 4**

I support the idea of intergenerational dialogue in publications, but this particular proposal does not seem to be arising organically from a professional need.

Again, there is an opportunity here to publish new ideas from new voices, but it's unclear what exactly young professionals would seize upon in Fleckner's writings.

Fleckner and Jimmerson are both veteran authors and well-known voices in the field.

The contributors cannot be evaluated because they have not been identified.

Reject

I could only see this possibly moving forward is if it were truly an intergenerational professional dialogue. New professionals reacting to John Fleckner's writings is not intergenerational dialogue. The book would need to be more thematic and not exclusively framed by Fleckner's writings. In sum, this proposal seems like a vehicle to republish of Fleckner's writings, which I believe the publications board did not support previously.

It is always useful to reflect on the evolution of the archives profession. John is the living embodiment of that evolution and his writings are influential in ways current archivists may not know. Having newer archivists comment on the selected works allows both an acknowledgement of change and a recognition of foundation.

Many archivists may not be familiar with the history of the profession and the relationship of early theory to current theory and practice.

Both John and Rand are accomplished authors.

This is an assumption as the contributors are not named. I'm assuming given the reasonable number of essays selected and the wealth of smart archivists that a good team could be selected.

This is very individual specific and while John's influence is deep and wide, the format and content may not be in high demand across the profession.

There is some crossover with the museum profession, but I imagine a small market there and even smaller beyond.

Accept with minor revisions (specify below if not noted above)

**Reviewer 6**

The emphasis in many essays on advocacy (including communication with non-archivists and archivists' role as educators) speaks to a persistent need in the profession.

Historical perspective on the profession and archival practice is valuable, though other publications offer that; the unique contribution here is the proposed dialogue between archivists of different generations, which would present a new perspective on changes and continuities in the profession.

Both are eminently well qualified with extensive publication records. I am uncertain about Jimerson's editing experience but have no concerns.

Not yet known. It would be helpful to see a more concrete explanation of how contributors will be selected, how much original insight or creativity will be encouraged in their commentary essays, and what the expectations will be as far as their writing/publishing experience.

Market and audience addressed only minimally. Table of contents not yet finalized.

I could imagine individual essays and commentaries being in high demand, especially for use in classes; marketability for the book as a whole is more difficult to assess since the concept and format of this book are unique.

Some demand is likely in allied professions, particularly those in which Fleckner is well known. This book seems less likely to appeal to the general public.

Co-publication opportunities and straightforward concept and timeline make this project seem very doable.

Emphasis on archival advocacy, education, and collaboration supports SAA objectives and values.

Accept with minor revisions (specify below if not noted above)

The idea of intergenerational conversation is compelling; I wonder if it's possible to take that a step further by having Fleckner (or other archivists of his generation) provide some current commentary or engagement with the response essays. It's difficult to evaluate the overall potential and likely impact of this structure before the essays and potential contributors are selected.