

August 14, 2005

From: Nancy A. Naples, Chair, Editorial and Publications Committee

Subject: Annual Report from Editorial and Publications Committee

Note: Items requiring action by the Board of Directors indicated in bold

I. The Editorial and Publications Committee had one primary activity during 2004-2005: solicitation and review of applications for the editorship of the SSSP Newsletter. The Committee received two applications, one from Emory Burton and the other from Ken Kyle. The Committee reviewed their vision statements and budgets and then interviewed each candidate.

The Board is responsible for the final decision regarding selection of the next editor of the SSSP Newsletter, and it is the Editorial and Publications Committee's recommendation that the Board select Ken Kyle for this position.

The Committee also recommends that the Society send a letter of appreciation for Stephen Couch's 6 year service as Editor of the SSSP Newsletter.

II. Update on Presidential Series. At the 2004 Meeting Alan McClare, Executive Editor for Rowman & Littlefield agreed to send out one proposal for review. This proposal was from Barbara Katz Rothman Jeffrey Bussolini, Ariel Ducey and Ananya Mukherjea for a volume entitled Science and Technology as a Social Problem. He was only able to find one reviewer who agreed to provide comments on the proposed volume. This reviewer did not recommend publication due to factors that had been discussed at the 2004 meeting (e.g. age of some of the articles, lack of range, and availability of better strategies to put together readers for this topic. As a consequence of this review and of the small number of sales of the already published volumes in the series, Mr. McClare informed us that Rowman & Littlefield would not renew the contract with SSSP to publish additional volumes. All of those who proposed volumes for the series were notified. These include:

Science and Technology as social Problems to be edited by Barbara Katz Rothman, Jeffrey Bussolini, Ariel Ducey and Ananya Mukherjea

The Emergence and Transition of the Environment as a Social Problem to be edited by Lisa Anne Zilney and Glenn Coffey

Social Movements and Social Problems to be edited by Nella Van Dyke

Law and Social Control: Social Problems Perspectives to be edited by A. Javier Treviño and Mathieu Deflem

The Program of Crime to be edited by Steven Barkan

Methods of Researching Social Problems to be edited by R. Kirk Mauldin

The Committee requests that the Executive Board send a letter to these members thanking them for the time and thought that went into their proposals, apologizing for any inconvenience, and encouraging them to seek other outlets for publication.

III. The Committee discussed the issue of “a recommendation to revise the SSSP By-Laws to allow more flexibility in the length of term held by the Social Problems editor.” The consensus of the Committee is that the current length of term, 3 years, should be maintained.

The Committee would like the Board to send a letter of appreciation to outgoing Social Problems editor, Jim Holstein for his service to the Society in his role as editor.

III. In an email discussion, Committee members responded to a request from Amanda Millar, Cambridge Scholars Press, regarding whether or not SSSP would have “any interest in submitting a proposal for the publication (perhaps as an edited collection of essays) of the proceedings for The Society for the Study of Social Problems 55th Annual Meeting.” Given the lack of enthusiasm for this request, we decided to decline the offer.

IV. James Orcutt agreed to taken over as Chair of the Committee for 2005-2006.

V. New Business

A. Past-president Kathleen Ferraro asked the Committee to consider developing a policy regarding critiques that appear in the Newsletter. She was concerned that she did not get a chance to respond to the critique of her presidential address at the time that it appeared and that she was not given advanced warning that it was to be published. The Committee discussed her request and consensus could not be reached first over email and then at the meeting on Friday. Some members felt that this would compromise the editorial discretion of the editor, others felt that if it would increase dialogue, it would be an advantage to have responses to critiques published simultaneously.

The consensus of the Committee was that the Board advise the incoming editor to be sensitive about the publication of critiques of presidential addresses but that it should be left to the discretion of the editor how to handle situations like this in the future.

B. Incoming Social Problems Editor, Amy Wharton, submitted a proposal to the Committee requesting permission to publish a special section of Social Problems on titled “The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology Twenty Years Later: Looking Back, Looking Ahead” based on an article published in Social Problems by Judith Stacey and Barrie Thorne in 1985 (see the attached proposal). The Committee voted unanimously to support the proposal for the special section.

Submitted by,

Nancy A. Naples
Chair, Editorial and Publications Committee (2004-2005)

In attendance at the meeting of the Editorial and Publications Committee (August 14, 2005):

Attendees:

Committee Members:

Nancy Naples, Committee Chair
Rob Benford
Pat Martin
James Orcutt

Ex Officio Members:

Stephen Couch, Editor, *Social Problems Forum: SSSP Newsletter* [non-voting]
Jim Holstein, Editor, *Social Problems* Editor [non-voting]
Amy Wharton, incoming *Social Problems* Editor [non-voting]
Bruce Johnson, BFA Committee Chair [voting member]

Guest:

Alan McClare, Executive Editor, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers
Rebekah Darksmith, University of California Press

To: SSSP Publications Committee

From: Amy S. Wharton
Editor, *Social Problems*

Re: Publication of special section in *Social Problems*

Date: August 1, 2005

Social Problems has published many now-classic papers in its time. Among them is Judith Stacey and Barrie Thorne's 1985 article, "The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology" (vol. 32, pp. 301-316). Twenty years ago, Stacey and Thorne argued that mainstream sociology – in contrast to other social science disciplines, like anthropology – had successfully resisted attempts by feminist scholars to transform the field's theoretical and conceptual frameworks. Stacey and Thorne attributed this lack of success to several factors, including the legacy of functionalism, quantitative sociologists' treatment of gender as a variable, and the sexism of Marxist scholarship.

At this year's ASA Meetings, the Sex & Gender Section will commemorate the twenty year anniversary of Stacey and Thorne's paper with an invited panel titled "The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology Twenty Years Later: Looking Back, Looking Ahead." In organizing this session, my goal was to inspire discussion of the state of feminist sociology. This necessarily involves some "looking back" to assess the current relevance of Stacey and Thorne's observations, but it also requires us to "look ahead" and chart the course for feminist sociology during the next twenty years.

This goal motivated my selection of panelists for this invited session. They include: Judith Lorber, Raka Ray, Leila Rupp, Denise Segura, and Christine Williams. Judith Stacey and Barrie Thorne will also be joining the panel as discussants. Included among these speakers are the first

editor of *Gender & Society* (Judith Lorber) and its current editor (Christine Williams). The panel also includes feminist scholars, such as Raka Ray and Denise Segura, whose work is transnational in scope or deals primarily with women of color. Leila Rupp, whose discipline is history but whose research is much more broadly interdisciplinary, provides yet another vantage point from which to consider these issues.

I would like to publish an edited collection of these presentations as a special section in *Social Problems*. As the publisher of the original article, *Social Problems* is an obvious outlet for this collection. Although *Social Problems* has published much feminist scholarship over the years, this special section will bring increased visibility to the journal and remind readers of its important role in publishing cutting-edge feminist work.

All of the presenters are enthusiastic about contributing to this special section and are preparing their remarks with this goal in mind. To the extent possible, given busy schedules, all have agreed to share their presentations with one another prior to the panel, thus making possible greater engagement between speakers. As of today (August 1), three of the five panelists have circulated at least the basic thrust of their comments.

Publication Logistics and Schedule:

This special section would include: (a) a short introduction (by me); and (b) a series of five short essays (e.g., 10-15 pages) by each of the presenters listed above, with comments by Stacey and Thorne. Depending upon space, it may be possible as well to include some additional commentaries – for example, discussion among the presenters, comments from the audience at the session, or even additional invited essays from other feminist sociologists.

I have made arrangements to have the session professionally tape-recorded and, if the Committee agrees with this proposal, will have it transcribed. (These costs should run approx. \$225: ASA charges \$75 to have the session taped; transcription should cost approx. \$150 for a 90 minute tape. I will request permission to pay these expenses from my *Social Problems* budget.)

Ideally, I would like to include the special section in the August 2006 issue of *Social Problems*. To meet this deadline, manuscripts must be ready by mid-April. Christine Williams has agreed to help with editing and organization. Along with our own “in-house” review of the essays, each would receive at least one expedited external review. Because these essays are based on invited presentations that must go to press on a fairly accelerated pace, the journal’s normal editorial policy of obtaining four blind, external reviews is not feasible. These departures from standard operating procedures should not result in an inferior product, however. I will not publish any paper that I or the reviewers feel falls short of the quality *Social Problems*’ readers expect.

I understand that any departures from normal editorial practices require the Publication Committee’s approval. I hope that you will support this proposal for a special section of *Social Problems*. Please let me know if you have any questions or recommendations. Thanks for your consideration of this request.