

SSSP

Editorial and Publications Committee Report

David Fasenfest, Chair, 2015-2016

The committee meet on August 19th to discuss matters before the committee. The following reflects the actions and considerations of this committee.

- 1) The election of Corey Dolgon to serve as the Chair of the Editorial and Publications Committee 2016-2017 was ratified;
- 2) The committee expressed appreciation for Pamela Quiroz' work editing of *Social Problems* and UNANIMOUSLY recommended that she continue as the Editor of *Social Problems* for the coming year;
- 3) After a review of the Publisher's Report and the Marketing Plan submitted to the Editorial and Publications Committee, there was a lively discussion with representatives of the Oxford University Press, leading to:
 - a) OUP provided an explanation of the calculation of the Impact Factor, placed the decline of the IP into perspective, and pointed to the impact of the journal as measured by the 5-year Impact Factor, a measure that more accurately reflects the journal's influence;
 - b) The EPC rejected the proposal to have revenue generating Banner Ads in the journal on the grounds that it would not generate much income, it would reduce the space available on the website, and did not reflect the values implicit in both SSSP and OUP;
 - c) The EPC noted that the Marketing Plan was long on goals and plans to promote the journal's contents, but lacked clear implementation plans and the means to carry out those goals. Over the next year the committee will seek clarification from OUP on what concrete steps they intend to take to expand the readership of *Social Problems*;
- 4) The committee heard from Glenn Muschert and Victoria Pittman from Policy Press on the recent release of the *Agenda for Social Justice*. The press pointed out that this was a chance to introduce themselves to the membership, to seek new projects, and perhaps to build a relationship with SSSP. The costs associated with this release were born by the Press, and future projects would have to be negotiated on a different basis.
 - a) Glenn was asked to return to his committee to assess and clarify what they see as the role of planned publications and their relationship to Policy Press. The EPC did not see itself as that of an Editorial Board for future publications proposed by that committee, or in its relationship with Policy Press, unless the *Agenda for Social Justice* becomes a

periodic SSSP publication going forward.

- 5) The committee had a detailed discussion with Pam on the operation of the journal, its strengths and its challenges. There are several observations of note:
 - a) As the number of submissions increased the workload processing these articles, the need for more reviewers, and the activities of and demands on the Editorial Office has similarly been increased;
 - b) It was noted that there was no provision on the OUP website for the journal for the placement of accepted articles online prior to print, even though this had been implemented prior to the migration over to OUP. The EPC asks that the SSSP Administrative office find out why this promised feature is not present;
 - b) A concern was raised about the need to adequately fund the operation of the journal, in light of the search for a new Editor, and in a climate of potentially lower or no institutional support accompanying applications for that position;
 - c) A review of the existing budget revealed several positions that we felt were under-financed give the work being performed. Pam is going to provide the EPC with a detailed projection of what it would take to adequately operate the Editorial activities of the journal to aid the EPC in reviewing applications for Editor.
- 6) Kasey Henricks provided an overview of the activities of the Social Media Committee to supplement the report submitted to the EPC. He and his committee was commended for their outstanding activities to promote the content of the journal on a wide range of social media, and felt the permanent but minimal allocation of \$5000 to that effort was well worthwhile, and should be reviewed over the coming year;
 - a) A question was raised about whether the Social Media Committee was to be a permanent addition operating to promote the journal, or simply a creation of Pam as the Editor of *Social Problems*. The consensus was that this activity was important, and discussions should begin to make this committee permanent and its continuation not an added burden on any new Editor;
 - b) Consequently, the EPC felt that the work of the Social Media Committee, while specifically promoting the work published in *Social Problems*, was important and served the larger interests of SSSP. We recommend that some form of institutionalization with SSSP should be considered to assure continuation of their work and decoupled as an arm of the journal's operation.
 - c) We also discussed that much of the activities falling performed by this Social Media Committee should rightfully fall under the scope of what Oxford University Press should

be providing. We request that the SSSP Administrative staff consult the publication contract with OUP and see that they perform functions as specified or promised in the contract, and not as something for which additional fees will be charged.

d) The committee requested that Kasey prepare a detailed set of activities and project the budget necessary to perform the functions of the Social Media Committee. It was pointed out, for example, that a budget allocation of only \$1000 for a Media Consultant (and that it came out of the stipend for the Editor) was inadequate;

7) The remainder of our meeting was devoted to a discussion of the search for a new Editor for Social Problems, and the finalizing of the proposed advertisement to that end (attached):

a) The committee will wait to see how many applications are submitted, and will decide on a mechanism for reviewing them at a later date;

b) Committee members were encouraged to begin having discussions with prospective Editors during the conference in order to increase the pool of applicants;

c) The Committee will begin the process of evaluating the funding of the Editorial Office once applications detail what levels of support may be forthcoming.