To: SSSP Board of Directors
         Editorial and Publications Committee
         Social Problems Advisory and Associate Editors
From: Becky Pettit, Editor, *Social Problems*
Re: 2013-14 Annual Report
Date: July 22, 2014

This report documents the activities of the editorial offices and staff at the University of Washington from June 1, 2013-May 31, 2014. I want to begin by thanking you for giving me the opportunity to serve as Editor of *Social Problems*. I am honored and privileged to have served in this position. I found my duties as Editor both rewarding and challenging and I thoroughly enjoyed thinking about how to engage and advance the range of scholarship submitted to *Social Problems*.

Editorial Office
All new and revised manuscripts submitted to *Social Problems* during the past year have been managed by the editorial office at the University of Washington. I was fortunate to have the excellent assistance of three part-time staff: Erin Powers, the managing editor; Sarah Diefendorf, the editorial assistant; and Amy Jo Woodruff, the production editor. I was privileged to have such an extraordinary team and I deeply appreciate the support of the SSSP and the University of Washington, which enabled me to recruit and retain such talented staff for my entire editorial term.

The editorial office benefited from the expertise of our five associate editors: Kenneth (Andy) Andrews, Jennifer Jordan, Christopher Lyons, Ziad Munson, and Abigail Saguy. More than 50 sociologists agreed to serve as advisory editors. Advisory editors reviewed 2-3 papers per year, provided reviews quickly when necessary, and helped to resolve discrepancies in reviews. I also selected 20 student editors from the University of Washington, Washington State University, and the University of British Columbia to assist in the editorial process. I met with student editors approximately every two weeks to discuss incoming manuscripts and reviews. Student editors were instrumental in summarizing comments of external reviewers and helping to select reviewers. They were a vital part of the editorial team.

Budget
The budget was revised over the course of the year to support the continued transition to on-line ahead of print. The revised budget was reviewed and approved by the BFA. The journal operated within the revised budget.

Manuscript Submissions and Processing
The editorial office at the University of Washington was responsible for all issues of *Social Problems* during the past year and through November 2014. We have accepted all papers for 2014 and 7 additional manuscripts as stipulated in the transition document and agreed upon with the new editorial team for February 2015. We believe papers we publish in *Social Problems* represent the finest scholarship on a broad range of social issues. And, it is our hope that they are of interest, and accessible, to the broad and diverse readership of *Social Problems*.

We did not receive a copy of the 2013 Presidential Address. As a result, we did not publish it as the lead article in the first issue of the 2014 volume as is customary.

We are an extremely selective journal, publishing approximately 8 percent of original submissions. All submissions to the journal were initially reviewed by two members of the editorial board (an editorial board member and me). If a paper was determined to be appropriate for peer review, we solicited the advice of three external reviewers. Table 1 compares submission information between 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. Between June 1, 2013, and May 31, 2014, we received 340 new submissions to *Social Problems*. This represents a 3.7% increase in submissions over the corresponding period in 2012-2013.

Table 1. Mean Days to Decision for New Submissions to Social Problems between June 1, 2011, and May 31, 2014

Year	Total	Deflects	Rejects	R&Rs
2011-12				
Mean Days to Decision	120.7 days	39 days	143 days	157.2 days
N/Total Submissions	292/292	78/292	102/292	112/292
%	100%	27.6%	34.9%	38.3%
2012-13				
Mean Days to Decision	108.8 days	32.7 days	136.4 days	155.4 days
N/Total Submissions	328/328	98/328	171/328	59/328
%	100%	29.8%	52.1%	17.9%
2013-14				
Mean Days to Decision	86.8 days	26.6 days	119.8 days	136.7 days
N/Total Submissions	274/340	101/340	151/274	22/274
%	80.6%	29.7%	55.1%	8.0%

Of the 340 new manuscripts submitted between June 1, 2012, and May 31, 2013, we made 274 initial decisions prior to the editorial transition to UIC on June 1. Our average time to decision was 86.8 days. All manuscripts sent out for review received at least three peer reviews and most manuscripts were reviewed by at least one advisory or associate editor. I reviewed all of the materials associated with each manuscript and wrote all of the decision letters. In the rare cases where I had a conflict of interest, manuscripts and associated materials were assigned to an associate editor.

We sent approximately 70% of all new manuscripts out for peer review. Of the 340 manuscripts submitted between June 1, 2013, and May 31, 2014, we decided to not send 101 manuscripts out for peer review. In other words, 29.7% of all new submissions were "deflected" or "desk rejected". Our average time to decision on manuscripts not sent out for peer review was 27 days. We extended "revise and resubmit" (R&R) decisions to 22 manuscripts sent out for peer review, or 8% of manuscripts on which decisions have been made. Our average time to decision for R&Rs is 137 days. We rejected 151 manuscripts sent out for peer review, or 55% of manuscripts on which decisions have been made. Our average time to decision for manuscripts that are rejected with peer review is 120 days.