This report was prepared by Brian M. Pollins, acting as the chair of the ISA Publications Committee (members include Shirin Rai, John Ravenhill, W. Andy Knight, Robert Denemark, Shannon Blanton, James Lebovic, and Stacie Goddard with ex-officios Kelly Kadera, Laura Sjoberg, Dan Nexon, Jef Huysmans, João Nogueira, Cameron Thies, Laura Neack, Renee Marlin-Bennett, Michael Colaresi, Gerald Schneider, Paul Diehl, T.V. Paul, Brett Ashley Leeds and Mark Boyer). The report was submitted January 20, 2017 for the 2017 Governing Council meeting in Baltimore.

**FULL REPORT**

Our ISA editors and their staffs each year now compile a very impressive set of detailed data detailing manuscript submissions, acceptance rates, turn-around times, manuscript reviewers, as well as their journal’s impact scores and vision for the near-term future. It is truly impressive how much thought and effort the editors and staff at each journal puts into these annual reports, and they are easily found under the Publications tab on the ISA site. I urge you to take a closer look at these individual reports housed at the ISA website. Here I will concentrate on overarching issues and highlights concerning ISA publications during 2015 as well as looking ahead at larger trends. Major points include the following:

The relationship with our new publisher, Oxford University Press, was off to a good start in its first year in 2016. Two points of great importance: 1) An internal ISA request from several journal editors for an increase in their subvention from the Association resulted in a renegotiation of our contract with OUP and an extension of the length of our contract to 2026. The Publications Committee discussed this proposed contract extension proposal and unanimously recommends that the Governing Council approve the contract extension. The resulting increase in funds from OUP to ISA will necessitate discussion within ISA Publications in 2017 (and perhaps beyond) as to how to best allocate these extra subvention funds. 2) The purchase of Compendium rights from Wiley and a possible new arrangement regarding those rights with OUP (authorized by GC at our 2016 Meeting) was indeed brought about with OUP’s Reference division. Hence the Publications Committee will be involved with this reorientation of our Compendium project, quite possibly under a new name. Finally, I find it fair to say that while our transition to OUP has been a happy one, it has not been seamless for every one of our editorial teams. There were some bumps in the road regarding copy editing and the early view of certain accepted publications. Teething problems are likely to occur in any transition of this considerable size, and in my view, both OUP and our editors and staff have worked above and beyond to serve the Association and its members well. Further detail on some of these problems are described in individual journal reports for those who wish to see.

Regarding Web presence, I can repeat a point made in last year’s Report: it is important to note that visits to ISA journal sites, and downloads of articles (some of which are revenue-generating) continue to grow tremendously. In part, this is due to OUP’s marketing and Web acumen. In part it is due to academia’s continuing shift to the electronic realm. We need to have editors and a publisher with serious Web savvy.

The Impact Scores and Rankings for six of our journals have generally strengthened. These ISI scores vary from year-to-year for all journals. As noted in previous Annual Reports, it is best to watch the five-year average for a given journal, so we will need to be patient in tracking our numbers since our journals are different ages (some mature, others quite new to the ISI system), and the “scoring rules” require continuous monitoring given the varied mission of our journals.
Finally, our newest offering, the *Journal of Global Security Studies* will just be entering its 3\textsuperscript{rd} volume so is probably 2-3 years away from having a formal impact score calculated.

The Committee conducted a successful search for a new editorial home for *International Studies Review*. The term for the current team led by Kelly Kadera and Laura Sjoberg ends in December 2017, and the Committee was pleased to receive four good proposals to succeed the current team. A separate memorandum describes the deliberation process and final recommendation by the Committee regarding these proposals.

**LOOKING ACROSS ALL SIX JOURNAL REPORTS FROM THE EDITORIAL TEAMS I UNDERSCORE THE FOLLOWING:**

**Submission Rates:**
Each of our journals maintains an annual submission rate sufficient to expect a long-term, high quality pool of publishable manuscripts. The submission rate at *ISQ* continues to rise significantly.

**Turnaround Time:**
Our target is **75 calendar days**. All ISA journals meet or better that standard, six to a significant degree (*IPS*, understandably in my view, has difficulty getting much below this number since it has distinctly the most global pool of authors and reviewers). These rapid turn-arounds make our journals attractive to authors.

**A CLOSING NOTE CONCERNING WOMEN’S PARTICIPATION AND PARTICIPATION IN ISA PUBLICATIONS BY SCHOLARS BEYOND THE USA. MY VALEDICTORY:**

As my last report as Chair of the Publications Committee, permit me to offer a longer view of someone who first came to ISA publications as co-editor of *International Studies Quarterly* in 1990. At that time, it was ISA’s only refereed publication. We received some 175 new submissions per year, not the 1,600 seen by our 7 editorial teams now. Far fewer women authors were seen in the early 1990s, and a much higher percentage of manuscripts originated from the U.S and Canada. I urge you once last time to look at the annual reports so painstakingly assembled by our editorial teams. You will find, overall, that women’s appearance in print today very nearly matches their submission rate of manuscripts. You will find that their invitations to review matches their submission rates, though in some cases their acceptance to review may fall below male colleagues. (Could it be they are younger on average and under more pressure to publish, or experience other life pressures?) You will find that scholars beyond the U.S. are participating in increasing numbers, both as authors and as reviewers. Those numbers too are rising each year. Can we still do better? Of course! We must. **My point is this:** From what I can see, our editors are now doing what they can to encourage and support participation from women and non-U.S. scholars. Further progress in these areas, such as desired by this Association, will need to come from initiatives beyond the Publications Committee and the journal editors specifically. Certainly, you will find a willing and ready partner in Publications, but I leave my post with sincere gratitude for all the effort made by so many of my colleagues in Publications in furthering the worthy goals of diversity and inclusiveness held by this Association.