

Final Report for the Editorial and Publications Committee Meeting

August 10, 2017

Attendees: Corey Dolgon, Anna Santiago, Greg Squires, Stephani Williams, Jackie Kraus, Val Jenness (by Phone)

The meeting was called to order at 10:30.

Agenda:

1. Discussion of Final report on selection of new editors
2. Report from Pam Quiroz (Editor of SP) and Kasey Hendricks (Social Media SP)
3. Report from Laura Bannon and Oxford University Press
4. Old Business
5. New Business—selecting a new committee chair

1. After a brief discussion of our selection for new editors, the discussion turned to the challenges the committee faced in recruiting applicants and the growing professional, institutional, organizational and macro-political challenges that SSSP and other organizations will likely continue to face. The major elements of this conversation included the following:

a) SSSP and the E&P committee should discuss the possibilities of creating more of a *pipeline* for new editors that recruits and nurtures scholars, encouraging potential applicants well before the year that the new editor(s) is selected. This is a longer-term strategy, but regardless of structural challenges that were discussed below, it will give the organization better chance to create interest and make clear responsibilities before the actual crunch time. One idea that came up was the possibility of the journal sponsoring an annual session that not only discussed publishing in the journal, but also talked about the publishing process and the editorial process—including what is entailed in being an editor.

b) We focused on the last two paragraphs of the report at length, and discussed the need for more resource support for journal editors and production process. We know that issues around resources and support have come up at various Board and committee meetings and the committee hopes to help create a more detailed suggestion for what level of support will be necessary to support editorial position and office adequately. The chair planned to meet with the new editors to ask that they keep this very question of support in mind as they begin their terms.

c) All of this discussion was contextualized by the success of the current editor and the journal as a whole over its recent history. But it is in within that context of success that

conversations about support must take place. As the journal achieves wider notoriety and its impact factor increases, the journal will need even higher levels of support. It may be necessary to consider a significant budget increase, not only to meet the current needs, but to consider how to meet increasing needs as well. The question of “what is SP’s potential to expand?” came up and, while we couldn’t answer it per se, the committee believes it has to be front and center as an ongoing question for future SSSP leaders.

d) The upcoming contract renewal, renegotiation process will be an opportune moment for the organization to have this conversation among itself, as well as engage current and potential publishers to get the best and most effective offers possible. We highly encourage next year’s committee, executive office and board seriously consider what the future of the journal could be, should be, and what level of resources and capabilities will be needed from a top line publisher.

e) Finally, we discussed that there may be certain types of institutions that will continue to offer at least modicum of support, but relying on institutions during current financial and political times suggests that only certain types of institutions will be able and willing to offer support, This is especially true as increasing numbers of institutions move towards Zero budgeting. Thus, SSSP has to consider how to enhance support to make up for dwindling institutional resources or will, otherwise editors will only come from major R1 universities with adequate budgets—or applicants may not come at all.

(Many of these topics are addressed in the previous report and were discussed during the previous Board Meetings)

2. We next invited Pamela Quiroz and Kasey Hendricks to join the meeting and discussed journal successes and challenges and social media production. In particular, we discussed the following:

a) The improvement in the impact factor was welcome and encouraging news. It does seem to be following a pattern (annual increase followed by decline followed by increase) but the five-year impact factor is impressive and has increased.

b) We discussed increased deflections and rejections and much the detail and explanations of slight changes are discussed in the Editors report.

c) We did discuss the issues concerned with the inability to reach the goals set forth by editors and OUP. This will be mentioned later, but from the editor’s perspective, the issue has to do with lack of resources for translations and inability to support attending more international conferences. More clarity in communications and expectations will be necessary moving forward.

d) We also discussed a number of production issues that had impacted scheduling earlier in the year but how communication issues and clarity had improved and the journal is now back on schedule. There will be an issue, however, for next editors to decide on a

production editor and whether it makes sense to utilize publishers' services at an increased cost or continue to hire and pay our own.

e) There was a significant discussion of communication among Editor, Executive Office and Committee, and chain of responsibilities as codified by SSSP but also as carried out formally and informally on a daily basis. Periodically, there were misunderstandings about who needed to be contacted regarding problems of contract fulfillment or expectations. The committee is still concerned that the publisher needs to be held to a higher level of accountability concerning the contract and that certain expectations around social media and international and conference presence need to be fleshed out in greater detail.

f) We asked the editor to present the committee with a more detailed budget proposal of what resources might be necessary to meet all of the goals set out not only for production but also for expanding social media, international distribution, etc.

g) Kasey Hendricks confirmed the need for better communications and clarified expectations for social media goals. (the rest of his support spelling out the many successes of the social media committee has already been shared with the Board).

h) We also discussed the altmetrics measures as potentially more important than impact factor as an indicator of journal penetration and professional and public consumption of research.

3. We then invited OUP staff into the meeting and discussed their final report (which you have also been given). The key aspects discussed with OUP included:

a) The increased support that may be necessary to improve Latin American effort.

b) How we might flesh out details for the meaning of indicators such as e-mail alerts. There are many measures that OUP presents in their reports but it is unclear that, for example, the number of people who sign up for e-mail alerts about certain articles actually click to view those same articles.

c) We asked for increased support for membership to do PR at conferences OUP doesn't go to.

d) We also discussed the possibility of having a publicity team either separate or as part of E&P committee that gets support from OUP to attend conferences and distribute publicity, journals, calls for papers, etc.

e) We also discussed how much better direct communication between OUP and the journal editors and social media staff had become. But once again the issues of expectations and production (especially with social media) need to be addressed. OUP has agreed to consider how they might improve support for social media.

4. In old business we did bring up a conversation about long term social media strategies and whether we are best served by a separate committee as part of editorial staff or a better production and support social media service from the journal's publishers.

5. In new business we selected Anna Santiago as the new chair of the committee.

Original draft Submitted by Corey Dolgon, August 12, 2017. Final draft submitted on February 28, 2018