

12-4-2018

Redefining the Review Process for Collaborative Librarianship

Jill Emery

Portland State University, jemery@pdx.edu

Michael Levine-Clark

University of Denver, michael.levine-clark@du.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/collaborativelibrarianship>



Part of the [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Emery, Jill and Levine-Clark, Michael (2018) "Redefining the Review Process for Collaborative Librarianship," *Collaborative Librarianship*: Vol. 10 : Iss. 3 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/collaborativelibrarianship/vol10/iss3/1>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 License](#)

This Editorial is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Collaborative Librarianship by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

Redefining the Review Process for *Collaborative Librarianship*

Jill Emery (jemery@pdx.edu)
Co-Editor, *Collaborative Librarianship*

Michael Levine-Clark (michael.levine-clark@du.edu)
Co-Editor, *Collaborative Librarianship*

The work of *Collaborative Librarianship* is in itself a very collaborative effort. This work begins as authors submit manuscripts as columns, From the Field reports, or scholarly articles - our three main types of contributions. When articles are received into our submission system, the co-editors review the submissions and determine whether they fit into those original categories or whether we should assign them somewhere else. As editors, we then review columns and From the Field reports, sometimes asking the editorial board for feedback. This is an open review process: we know who the authors are and they know who we are. It is relatively fast because we do not have to seek out external reviewers. And it seems to us to be fair.

Scholarly articles are sent out for double blind peer review, which entails much more work for everyone involved. Editors and authors spend a lot of (unnecessary) time preparing manuscripts for blind review. Submissions often contain details about organizations or authors that would make it impossible for the review to be completely blind. In order to make the process truly anonymous, we and the authors spend time removing all potentially identifying information - work that slows down the process for all of us, which may not actually help ensure a fairer evaluation, and which may remove crucial context that would help referees provide a careful review.

Finding reviewers can be time consuming. Our goal is to find two reviewers for every double blind review article, which often means asking previous authors, editorial board members, and

other experts. If reviewers feel that the double blind review has been compromised and they recognize the organizations or potential authors, they recuse themselves -- slowing down the review process even more.

For these reasons, the *Collaborative Librarianship* editorial board has decided to move to single blind review beginning with Volume 11. The authors will not know who the reviewers are, but the reviewers will know who the authors are. This is a small step to take in shifting the editorial process we undertake and one that we believe will ensure the quality and integrity for which *Collaborative Librarianship* has become known. We recognize this is an incremental change. At a time when there is a greater call for more open publishing processes in academia, there may be bolder and bigger steps to be taken in the future. For now, though, we feel this is the right approach for us.

Peer review is a part of our process. After the review is done, we, as co-editors, send referee comments back to the authors along with our own feedback and ask for the revisions advised by the reviewers. Sometimes this decision process results in a submission shifting from a scholarly article to a From the Field report. In other cases, significant revision may take a couple of drafts to fully resolve. After an article is accepted, it is sent to one of our copy editors for the final editorial work to happen. We are very fortunate to have four extremely talented copy editors who regularly do this work for us.



Emery & Levine-Clark: Redefining the Review Process

In the final stage of our publication cycle, the article is passed over to our layout editor, who formats the work to have a standard look and slots it into the designated section. When she has formatted all of the articles for a particular issue, then that issue is released for publication.

We publish an issue every three months, which means that each one of these steps must happen in a much shorter time frame than that. We are dedicated to publishing thoughtful high-quality work that informs librarianship. By making this small change to our editorial process, we believe that we will maintain those high standards while speeding up that process. Our entire editorial team is dedicated to this journal and to the collaborative effort required to make each issue possible.

