

ASM PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

29 APRIL 2003

Members: B. H. Blake (*Chair*, Jun–Dec 2002), R. D. Bradley, M. D. Engstrom, W. L. Gannon, R. D. Gettinger, V. Hayssen, E. C. Hellgren, D. A. Kelt, J. G. Kie, D. M. Leslie, Jr. (*Chair*, Jan 2003–present), E. P. Lessa, L. Marinelli, J. F. Merritt, E. H. Miller, G. R. Michener, T. J. O’Shea, P. S. Reynolds, E. A. Richart, N. G. Solomon

INFORMATION ITEMS

Highlights

ASM Publications received favorable attention this past year. In a *Nature* Correspondence (Vol. 420, 7 Nov 2002, page 15), the *Journal of Mammalogy* was compared to 13 other scientific periodicals relative to manuscript review time; 8 of them took longer than the *Journal*. Our review time was nearly one-half that of *Ecological Applications*, *Conservation Biology*, and *Journal of Applied Ecology*. The 14 journals were selected because they “have the highest science-impact scores or represent the largest professional societies” in particular categories (thanks to Mike Willig for bringing this to our attention). In an assessment of the Institute of Scientific Information’s Impact Rating, the *Journal* was the 6th most improved among 70 zoological journals from 1997 to 2001 (see <http://www.sit.wisc.edu/~ckwillia/Journals.htm> ; this site also provides numerous hyperlinks to journal guidelines and societal web pages and is a fine effort by Christopher Williams, Graduate Associate in the Department of Zoology, University of Wisconsin-Madison).

President Patterson separated the responsibilities of the Chair of the Publications Committee from those of the Journal Editor in December 2002. Leslie met with Allen Marketing & Management/Allen Press on 16 April and discussed online publishing and the future of small societies such as ASM; electronic manuscript tracking (Allen Track); electronic archival options (as accomplished for *Mammalian Species* last year); options for announcement of forthcoming issues of the *Journal*; BioOne; costs of extra pages anticipated in Vol. 84 in excess of the Board-approved 1,400 pages; issues with production, scheduling, and quality control of ASM publications; future special publications and their marketing; and the value of a member’s survey. Several important action and discussion items were identified and are included in the **Appendix** at the end of this report.

Personnel.—John Kie, Tom O’Shea, and Ted Miller, Associate Editors for the *Journal*, Chip Leslie, Editor for Special Features for the *Journal*, and Luigi Marinelli, Associate Editor for *Mammalian Species*, are ending their terms. Mark Engstrom resigned as Associate Editor for the *Journal* due to other commitments. After Board approval in June 2002 to increase the number of AEs for the *Journal* to 10, mid-year nominations of Eric Hellgren, Enrique Lessa, Eric Rickart, and Nancy Solomon as Associate Editors for the *Journal* were approved. Hellgren, Lessa, and Rickart began their terms in autumn 2002 and Solomon in January 2003. Because of changing workloads, our AM&M Managing Editor Eleanor Lohmann will be stepping down and will be replaced with AM&M Managing Editor Emily Kemmeter. We gratefully acknowledge the dedication and editorial contributions of the outgoing editors to ASM.

Journal of Mammalogy—1 May 2002 to 25 April 2003

Vol. 83, Nos. 1–4; issued on schedule; 1,182 pages published with no Special Features.

Vol. 84, Nos. 1–4 all issues full and on schedule, 2 Special Features anticipated; projected at 1,600 pages

Vol. 85, No. 1 full; No. 2, 14 manuscripts accepted.

Vol. 83 (2002): **106** manuscripts published

Vol. 84 (2003): **134** manuscripts scheduled to be published

Number of manuscripts submitted: **298** (compared to 280 last year)

Electronic submissions: **>50%** of manuscripts were submitted electronically as e-mail attachments

Rejection rate: **64%**

Handling times; Volume 84, Nos. 1–4

Submission of manuscript to acceptance: **8.2** months (vs. 7.8 last year)

Acceptance to publication: **9.4** months (vs. 8.7 last year)

Total time, submission to publication: **17.5** months (vs. 16.5 last year)

Geographic distribution of accepted manuscripts:

Vol. 83: 58% U.S., 6% Canada, 12% Latin America, 24% Other Foreign

Vol. 84: 61% U.S., 4% Canada, 9% Latin America, 26% Other Foreign

Mammalian Species—23 April 2002 to 1 April 2003

Total number of accounts published and to be published: **26**

Total number of pages in both fascicles: **139**

Autumn 2002: Nos. 703–714

Spring 2003: Nos. 715–728

Time from submission to publication: **2.4** years (range = 1.1–5.9 years)

Number of new accounts submitted and assigned to AEs: **17**

Total number of accounts with AEs: **57**

Total number of accounts with Editor: **4**

Numbers of new-species accounts assigned: **42**

Total number of accounts in preparation: **282** (137 overdue)

Number of accounts available online as PDF files: **631**

Letters or e-mail messages were sent to all past-due accounts

Special Publications

Anatomy of the Woodchuck.—The author continues with revisions. Conditions of publication continue to be that the author provide his entire manuscript, including the numerous line drawings, electronically and submit \$10,000 in support of publication; neither accomplished to date.

Other Proposals.—A proposed volume titled “Mammals of Coniferous Forests of the Pacific Northwest” was withdrawn from consideration and will be published elsewhere. Discussions continued regarding a volume on the biology of the Octodontidae, but to date, no proposal has been received.

ACTION ITEMS

New Editors: The Committee seeks Board approval of Floyd Weckerly and Dave Weller as Associate Editors and Edward Heske as Editor of Special Features for the *Journal* and Karen McBee as Associate Editor for *Mammalian Species*.

Implementation of Allen Track: The Committee seeks Board approval to “enroll” the *Journal* and *Mammalian Species* in Allen Track, permitting online submission and tracking of manuscripts (see #2 below). Estimated cost = \$13,650 during the 1st year, \$9,050 in subsequent years.

Archiving the Journal: Assuming we are invited, does the Board favor joining the “ecology” group of the archival company JSTOR (see #3 below). No cost.

APPENDIX

MEETING SYNOPSIS

ASM Publications Committee Chair & Allen Marketing and Management/Allen Press
16 April 2003; Lawrence, Kansas

Attendees: AM&M/AP, Marissa Barlow (Allen Track), Emily Kemmeter, Eleanor Lohmann, Angie Pfeifer, Theresa Pickel, Dave Stadler, Scott Starr; AMS, Chip Leslie

Meeting convened 9:00 AM

1. **Online Publishing and the Future of Small Societies such as ASM.**—Theresa Pickel presented an overview on strategies that scientific publishers (e.g., Society for Scholarly Publishing) are discussing relative to the survival of small societal publications within the universe of rapidly expanding availability of online publications (without change they are not optimistic). Much of this is like hitting a rapidly moving target, but here are some examples of possible pernicious impacts to a group like ASM. Relative to institutional subscribers, the days of librarians wanting both print and electronic are at an end. In only the past 2 years at Oklahoma State University (OSU), for example, print of *Auk*, *Condor*, *Wilson Bulletin*, and *Evolution* has been dropped because they are available in BioOne. Also, OSU no longer has print of any of the 360+ titles that they carried from Elsevier, such as the 3 parts of *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology*. It now can offer electronic access to all of Elsevier's 1,100+ titles for about the same price. In the past 2 years, OSU has dropped print for 16% of 70 "zoological" journals; at that pace, print will be gone in about 12 years. Relative to individual members, your host institution has BioOne and thus you have access to electronic files of each issue of the *Journal* as it is published, so why should you continue to be a member of ASM? The concern here is annually paying members, not patron, life, and other categories that do not pay annual dues. Clearly, such dynamics are going to affect ASM's bottom line. As such, societies need to assess their members' expectations and highlight the fact that they are more than a journal (dues are needed to produce journals, but note that about 56% of production costs for the *Journal* is printing/binding and shipping). Some of our sister societies are considering separate fees for membership and subscriptions, and online options for subscribers (which we could easily do through BioOne [see #5 below], perhaps enhancing international membership if the cost was reduced). The Publications Committee will continue to monitor these dynamics and open dialogue with the Membership Committee regarding future action.

2. **Electronic Manuscript Tracking.**—Marissa Barlow gave a demonstration of Allen Track with a comparison to Scholar One (BioOne endorses both). Most commercial offerings run on the same background software. Initial and annual maintenance costs for Allen Track have decreased from last year: *Journal*, \$3,500 set-up, \$1,200 annual maintenance, \$22.50/manuscript submitted (1st year = \$10,250; 2nd year = \$7,950—both assuming 300 submissions/year) or *Journal* and *Mammalian Species*, \$6,000 set-up, \$1,400 annual maintenance, \$22.50/manuscript submitted (1st year = 13,650; 2nd year =

9,050). Other societies have seen increased submissions, author satisfaction, and even membership with implementation, decreased time from submission to publication, decreased costs in postage, and increased reviewer pool via postage-free inclusion of international scientists. Benefits include automatic reminders to reviewers and AEs shortening time from submission to publication, report generating options on manuscript turnaround, AE performance, etc., insertion of questions on membership status, opinions, and options to join society, and “looking modern.” In a poll of the Publications Committee, 70% contend that we should have such a submission protocol and include both publications. **ACTION:** Recommend that we “enroll” the *Journal* and *Mammalian Species* in Allen Track.

3. **Electronic Archival Options.**—Two years ago, Hugh Genoways proposed that back issues of the *Journal* be converted to PDF files, as we did with *Mammalian Species* a year ago. Therefore, the Publications Committee initially requested \$40K this year to create PDF files for all articles/notes in the *Journal* from 1919 to 2000 (beyond that, electronic files available from BioOne under our AM&M agreement). We contacted Princeton Imaging for an estimate of creating electronic archives for the *Journal* (see <http://www.princetonimaging.com/samples/asm/> for example of the *Journal*). Princeton Imaging is the archival company responsible for doing 100 years of *Condor*, which are available at no cost at The University of New Mexico Library (see <http://elibrary.unm.edu/condor/>). Almost immediately after that, we learned that JSTOR (large, respected, for-profit archival company; see <http://www.jstor.org>) is considering inviting the *Journal* to join their “ecology” collection of publications. If we are selected by JSTOR, they will pay for all aspects of creating electronic files, and ASM will receive royalties estimated at \$1,000–2,000/year. ASM members could have password access to the *Journal* at the JSTOR site through a link at our website, but we lose control of electronic files themselves and the agreement with JSTOR is exclusive. We will not know for sure if the *Journal* is selected until sometime this summer (perhaps before the annual meeting). The two approaches would result in very different outcomes. Establishing archives ourselves and finding a place to house them, as accomplished by Cooper’s and Wilson societies, would involve an initial investment but would ensure perennial control over the electronic files and access as we define it. Working with JSTOR would result in higher institutional profile and no production costs for electronic files but no control over distribution and access, albeit a benefit of membership could be electronic access to all back issues of the *Journal*. **DISCUSSION:** Which approach does ASM prefer?

4. **Forthcoming Issues.**—Discussed advanced release of the Table of Contents of forthcoming issues of the *Journal of Mammalogy*. AM&M can provide selected information from our forthcoming issues with author contacts (or a designated ASM spokesperson, like from the Public Relations Committee) and embargo information to their contracted public relations company on a schedule that we determine. We would have to provide such information to our AP Managing Editor in a timely fashion (i.e., as soon as we know what papers are going to be in an issue and have received copyright transmittals from authors; order not important). We also could provide such forthcoming information to the Informatics Committee for inclusion at the ASM website. **QUESTION:** Should the Publications Committee work with the Public Relations and Informatics committees to establish a protocol and policy?

5. **BioOne.**—Revenues to ASM from BioOne (in its 2nd year) were \$15,873.54 in FY 2002, down from about \$20K in FY 2001. Nevertheless, this continues to be a source of revenue that already has netted ASM about \$35K and was unexpected when our initial publishing agreement with AM&M began. Paid access to BioOne has reached nearly 500 subscribers, representing some 3.3 million online users/year. Institutional subscribers should continue to grow enhancing future revenues. The possibility exists to establish a “silo site” whereby members of ASM could access BioOne through our website, even if they are not affiliated with an institution that subscribes to BioOne. This could be offered as a benefit of membership. **DISCUSSION:** Should ASM through the Informatics Committee seek to establish such a “silo site”? Recall that revenues to individual members such as ASM are determined in part by “hits,”

so (**INFORMATION ITEM**) if you have access to BioOne, visit the *Journal* and open a paper or two, weekly!

6. **Extra Pages in Volume 84.**—The Board approved the publication of 1,400 pages in Volume 84 of the *Journal*, and Angie Pfeifer confirmed that AM&M agreed to share the costs of those 200 pages over the contracted amount of 1,200. I did not receive a firm commitment for the same cost-share for pages in excess of 1,400 in 2003 (currently projected at 1,600), but the door clearly was not closed. Angie will see how it affects production costs and subsequent royalties. She suggested that, in the future, costs of producing additional pages could be covered to a degree by increasing institutional rates (recall they hold steady at \$170/year until the end of our 5-year contract); I was told that libraries do not balk at increased rates, particularly in our price range, when more scholarly information is being published. But, relative to #3 above, how long will institutions subscribe to both print and online versions of periodicals? **QUESTION:** Do we want to revisit the issue of institutional rates?

7. **Production, Scheduling, and Quality Control.**—We reaffirmed the partnership nature of the ASM–AM&M publishing agreement whereby if we both work to maximize quality and efficiency, products and profits will be enhanced. While we operate under a production schedule that establishes minimal expectations, quality and efficiency are enhanced if manuscripts are sent to the Managing Editor as soon as the Journal Editor has finished them (even one at a time), which typically could be well before the per-issue copy deadline. AM&M is concerned that we are not taking full advantage of the editorial services provided to us (e.g., we are spending too much time on copyediting causing delays in receipt of manuscripts). They suggest that we focus on the scientific content and presentation and stop doing copyediting completely on an issue or two and see if we are happy with the outcome in proof. AM&M has contacted ISI Research about adding the *Journal* to EndNotes Style, a software program that automatically formats citations in to a particular journal format. Specific issues from the past year (e.g., poor copyediting on one *Mammalian Species* fascicle and insertion of a signature from another journal in ours) were discussed in some detail; AM&M was very conciliatory and believes these to be isolated and not typical.

8. **Future Publications and Marketing.**—It is clear that AM&M will not partner with ASM on special publications that they do not see as marketable, and any future contract for a title will have to include monies for marketing (something both parties underestimated in *The Wild Mammals of Montana*). ASM, of course, is free to pursue publication of any title by itself, assuming all risk and reward. **DISCUSSION:** Input from the ASM Board regarding the mission of the Special Publication series is desired (e.g., is it a mission of the series to bring titles to print that have scientific merit, even to a small audience, but little profit potential, or should we focus narrowly on marketability?).

9. **Electronic Member's Survey.**—ASM does not seem to have a thorough sense of members' concerns on a variety of issues related to ASM. A member's survey could clarify such issues and serve to direct future action (see #1 above). For example, we could gain valuable insights on membership desirability relative to online availability of the *Journal* elsewhere and author satisfaction with our publishing process. AM&M could circulate such a survey electronically through our membership database at little cost, or direct members to ASM website to fill out a survey. Coordination of such a survey would seem to be under the purview of the Membership Committee, but the Publications Committee desires more detailed input on issues related to ASM publications. **DISCUSSION:** Should a member's survey be pursued?