SAA Book Proposal Assessment

TEMPLATE PROVIDED FOR
PROPOSER AND REVIEWER REFERENCE

Do NOT complete—
actual review should be completed using webform
(link emailed to reviewers)

DOCUMENT OVERVIEW: This template previews criteria that peer reviewers are asked to assess when commenting on the book proposal. Each proposal will include a publication prospectus, writing sample, and CV.

Please note that the names of proposers are known the by peer reviewers, but not vice-versa. In other words, you will be participating in a single blind review process, as is common with book publications. The criteria are flexible and interpreted in the light of the specific type and subject of work being provided. Reviewers are asked to submit reviews via an online form; the URL will be mailed to you when we request your assistance.

Once peer reviewers have submitted comments, the SAA Publications Editor draws upon information from the completed forms to reach a publication decision. After comments have been submitted, the Publications Editor prepares a draft recommendation and leads a final round of discussion with the members of the editorial board. Once concluded, a publication decision is conveyed to the proposer, with a summarized version of the feedback and selected, representative comments. In the case of works that show some promise, but where the Board is not yet ready to accept a proposal, the editor will work with proposers to suggest specific enhancements or changes, should the Proposer wish to resubmit.

PEER REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS: Neither your individual ratings nor your identity will be shared directly with the author, but aggregate data and comments may be shared, as noted below. When you have completed your review, please submit the form, which will be reviewed by the Publications Editor. (A copy of the response will be emailed to you.)

Name of Reviewer:

Name of Proposer(s):

Title of Proposed Book:

1. **Criterion: Meets professional need (select one)**

   Poor: Does not meet a professional need
   Fair: Marginally meets a professional need by partially addressing a theoretical or practical problem or challenge
   Good: Meets a professional need by addressing a challenge that is common, but less critical
   Excellent: Meets a professional need by addressing a critical, broad ranging challenge

   Comments (may be shared with proposer):

2. **Criterion: Makes unique contribution to professional discourse (select one)**

   Poor: Does not bring forth new knowledge or fill an existing gap in the literature in a relevant or timely topic
   Fair: Brings forth new knowledge or partially fills an existing gap in the literature in a somewhat relevant or not particularly timely topic
   Good: Brings forth some new knowledge or fills an existing gap in the literature in a relevant or timely topic
   Excellent: Brings forth new knowledge or fills an existing gap in the literature in a highly relevant or timely topic

   Comments (may be shared with proposer):

3. **Criterion: If applicable, meets stated aims of series for which book is proposed** (i.e., https://www2.archivists.org/publications/archival-futures/submission-guidelines or https://www2.archivists.org/publications/book- publishing/module-guidelines-trends-in-archives-practice) **(select one)**

   Poor: Does not meet stated aims
   Fair: Meets stated aims partially or in an insufficient fashion
   Good: Mainly meets stated aims and could be improved with a few tweaks
   Excellent: Wholly meets stated aims and/or does so in a fresh, exciting way.
   Comments (may be shared with proposer):

4. Criterion: Author/editor qualifications (select one)

Poor: Inadequate writing sample provided and/or has few or no prior publications; difficult to assess expertise in subject area; if compilation, no editing experience or no evidence that they can manage an editing project

Fair: adequate writing sample or has some prior publications; demonstrated knowledge of subject area; if compilation, some editing experience or some evidence that they can manage an editing project

Good: Record of peer-reviewed publications and/or very good writing sample; demonstrated expertise in subject area; if compilation, has editing experience

Excellent: Substantial peer-reviewed publication record and/or excellent writing sample. Proposer many have recognized expertise in subject; if compilation, has editing experience

Comments (may be shared with author):

Contributor Qualifications (may be shared with proposer). If applicable, please assess the suitability and qualifications of the contributors who are suggested for the work, in the case of edited volumes, commenting on subject expertise and the ability to articulate fresh perspectives, as well as writing background and experience.

5. Criterion: Proposal completeness (select one)

Poor: Poorly developed proposal; major gaps exist; does not comply with proposal template

Fair: Somewhat developed proposal; marginally complies with proposal template

Good: Adequately developed proposal with most necessary information ; substantially complies with proposal template, but some gaps

Excellent: Fully developed proposal with all necessary information; fully complies with proposal template; provides clear scope, realistic timeline; all dependencies identified and addressed

e; all dependencies identified and addressed

Comments (may be shared with author):

6. Criterion: Marketability (primary audience—SAA members; archivists, archives students) (select one)

Poor: Perceived demand is low or non-existent

Fair: Perceived demand medium; may not be salable at standard SAA price points; proposed format/design/ length does not enhance appeal

Good: Perceived demand high to medium; salable at standard SAA price points; proposed format/design/ length appealing

Excellent: Perceived demand very high; salable at standard SAA price points; proposed format/design/length highly appealing

Comments (may be shared with author):

7. **Criterion: Marketability (secondary audiences—allied professions, general public) (select one)**

Poor: Perceived demand is low or non- existent
Fair: Perceived demand medium; may not be sellable at standard SAA price points; proposed format/design/length does not enhance appeal
Good: Perceived demand high to medium; sellable at standard SAA price points; proposed format/design/length appealing
Excellent: Perceived demand very high; sellable at standard SAA price points; proposed format/design/length highly appealing

Comments (may be shared with author):

8. **Criterion: Contributes to/meets Publications Board goals/mission** (see https://www2.archivists.org/publications/book- publishing/guidelinesforbookproposals) **(select one)**

Poor: Does not support mission/goals; does not present a good return potential for outlay
Fair: Tangentially supports mission/goals by: a) potentially meeting the evolving needs of membership; and/or b) may be of interest to secondary audience(s); c) may generate return for outlay
Good: Largely supports goals/mission by: a) being a revised edition or translation of a previous work; and/or b) is an opportunity for co-publication with another publishing outlet; and/or c) has some expected return for timely outlay and/or d) partially meets the requirements found in the Excellent category.
Excellent: Fully supports goals/mission by: a) is a new or newly translated academic work on an advanced topic; b) establishes best practice(s); c) new work that needs evolving membership need(s) and/or d) is good value for initial outlay at agreed publication time

Comments (may be shared with author):

9. **Criterion: Contributes toward SAA's Strategic Plan and Core Organizational Values** (see https://www2.archivists.org/governance/strategic-plan) **(select one)**

Poor: Does not support plan and core organizational goals; does not present a good return on investment
Fair: Tangentially supports plan and values or does so only as by product; may generate return on investment but outcome is uncertain
Good: Largely support plan and values by integral relationship to SAA objectives; has likely expected return on investment relative to plan and core values.
Excellent: Fully supports plan and values; represents excellent return on investment by speaking directly to current needs and initiatives.

Comments (may be shared with author):

10. **Overall publication priority (select one)**

Low

Medium

High

Very High

11. Summary Recommendation (select one)

    Accept in current form
    Accept with minor revisions (specify below if not noted above)
    Revise and resubmit
    Reject

12. Additional comments for the author/suggested revisions

13. Other comments/thoughts (NOT to be shared with proposer)