Editorial: The Big Picture

I am frequently asked by potential authors and incoming *LRTS* Editorial Board members about the timeframe for submitting a paper and the publication timeframe for accepted papers. My response is that it depends. A paper may require significant revision, which is not necessarily an indication of the paper's quality. Papers may need to undergo a second round of peer review. Some papers are published within six months of submission, and others might be published a year after submission. There are so many variables that a straightforward answer is not possible.

Additionally, I am often asked to provide an overview of the process of writing a research paper, submitting it, the review process, and acceptance (or rejection), as it applies to *LRTS*. The submission, review and publication process is a collaboration between the author, reviewers, and editor. Reviewers are assigned papers based on their knowledge and expertise. Their feedback is critical to authors. All authors, including those papers are rejected, are provided with feedback and a copy of their paper showing suggested revisions.

Papers are rejected for various reasons. One of the primary reasons is that they are out of scope for *LRTS*. Another reason is that they do not conform to the structure required for a research paper and lack critical components, such as a literature review, a problem statement, research methodology, or analysis of research results. Opinion or think pieces, while thought provoking and sometimes inspirational, are also out of scope.

The acceptance process is not necessarily quick or smooth. A paper may require significant revision. Authors may get additional information that changes a paper, and that also involves revision. When an author's paper is accepted, it is copyedited and proofs are sent to the author. The author has a short timeframe to review the proof and submit changes to me. I submit the revised proofs to ALA Production Services, and this can be for up to five papers, depending on how many are in a given issue. ALA Production Services typesets the papers, and another round of proofs are sent to the copyeditor and me to review and approve. The final version of each issue includes my editorial, papers, book reviews, selection of cover art, and advertisements.

My term as *LRTS* Editor ends in December 2020 and as I enter the final year of my term, I reflect back on the papers I have accepted, the authors with whom I have worked, and the people who have served on the *LRTS* Editorial Board. It has been a privilege to work with these authors and my board. I have been fortunate to work with Brooke Morris-Chott from the ALCTS Office and Tim Clifford from ALA Production Services. I have had two excellent Book Review Editors in Norm Medeiros and Elyssa Gould. Collectively, we have sought to bring ALCTS members and the profession at large timely and relevant research papers on critical and emerging issues.

As with each editorial, I close with a preview of the issue's contents, which I hope you enjoy reading:

- ALCTS President Kristin E. Martin's annual report providing a summary of the division's activities for the 2018–2019 year. Much of this year's activities focused on the discussions with LLAMA and LITA.

- In her paper "The Adoption of NISO's Shared Electronic Resource Understanding (SERU) at U.S. Academic Libraries," Sunshine Carter details the analysis of a 2017 survey that she conducted of licensing practices and SERU use at libraries. The survey analyzed 108 responses from US academic libraries signing at least one license in the twelve months preceding the survey.

- A.L. Carson and Carol Ou discuss the challenges faced when their institutional repository evolved from a means to host open-access journals to a repository for other researcher created materials in their paper "Metadata Revisited: Updating Metadata Profiles and Practices in a Vendor-Hosted Repository." This process sometimes lacked clear metadata and descriptive guidelines. Resolving the problem included a metadata review to reconcile the fields used and provide recommendations on vocabularies and standards for capturing metadata.

- An essential, but often lacking, tool for effective collection development and management is a written collection development policy, or CDP. In "Nimble Collection Development Policies: An Achievable Goal," Helen Levenson details the history of CDPs, including a discussion of the RLG and WLN Conspectuses, and provides guidance for drafting an effective and contemporary CDP.

- "Experts or Dummies?: Quality of e-Book Pool and User Selections in a Consortial Demand Driven Acquisition Program" by Matthew J. Jabaily and Rhonda Glazier details the University of Colorado Colorado Springs' experience in a consortial demand driven acquisitions program. The authors analyzed data from EBSCO's GOBI acquisitions platform to assess the quality of the pool and purchased titles from the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL) publisher-based DDA program. Results showed that most available and selected titles were appropriate for academic libraries.

- Book reviews courtesy of *LRTS* Book Review Editor Elyssa Gould.