



Committee on Scholarly Publishing in South Africa
Report on Grouped Peer Review of Scholarly Journals in Humanities II:

Visual and Performing Arts



science
& technology

Department:
Science and Technology
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



© Academy of Science of South Africa

ISBN: 978-0-6399410-3-5

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.17159/assaf.2018/0028>

July 2018

Published by:

Academy of Science of South Africa (ASSAf)
PO Box 72135, Lynnwood Ridge, Pretoria, South Africa, 0040
Tel: +27 12 349 6600 Fax: +27 86 576 9520
E-mail: admin@assaf.org.za

Reproduction is permitted, provided the source and publisher are appropriately acknowledged.

The Academy of Science of South Africa (ASSAf) was inaugurated in May 1996. It was formed in response to the need for an Academy of Science consonant with the dawn of democracy in South Africa: activist in its mission of using science and scholarship for the benefit of society, with a mandate encompassing all scholarly disciplines that use an open-minded and evidence-based approach to build knowledge. ASSAf thus adopted in its name the term 'science' in the singular as reflecting a common way of enquiring rather than an aggregation of different disciplines. Its Members are elected on the basis of a combination of two principal criteria, academic excellence and significant contributions to society.

The Parliament of South Africa passed the Academy of Science of South Africa Act (No 67 of 2001), which came into force on 15 May 2002. This made ASSAf the only academy of science in South Africa officially recognised by government and representing the country in the international community of science academies and elsewhere.

Original artwork, Bomvana, by Peter Pharoah used in collage with classical instrument

Table of Contents

Acronyms/Abbreviations _____	5
Preface _____	7
Foreword _____	9
1. Periodic Peer Review of South African Scholarly Journals: Approved Process Guidelines and Criteria _____	11
1.1 Background _____	11
1.2 ASSAf Peer Review Panels (PRPs) _____	11
1.3 Initial Criteria _____	11
1.3.1 Editorial Process-Related Criteria: Generally Based on the National Code of Best Practice in Editorial Discretion and Peer Review Developed by ASSAf _____	12

1.3.2	Business-Related Criteria _____	12
1.3.3	Bibliometric Assessments _____	12
1.4	Process Guidelines for Setting up the Panels, Peer Reviewers, Panel Meetings and Reports for the Subject Peer Review of Journals _____	13
1.4.1	Background to ASSAf PRPs _____	13
1.4.2	Role of the Scholarly Publishing Unit (SPU) _____	13
1.4.3	Setting up Panels _____	13
1.4.4	Selecting Panel Members _____	13
1.4.5	Criteria for Membership _____	13
1.4.6	Conflict of Interest _____	14
1.4.7	Organising the Panels _____	14
1.4.8	Selection of Peer Reviewers (See above) _____	14
1.4.9	Panel Meeting and Procedures _____	14
1.4.10	Post-meeting Procedures and Panel Reports _____	15
2.	Special Considerations Concerning South African Visual and Performing Arts Journals	15
3.	Panel Members _____	17
4.	Consensus Reviews of Journals in the Group _____	17
4.1.	Music _____	17
4.1.1	African Music _____	17
4.1.2	Journal of the Musical Arts in Africa _____	20
4.1.3	Musica _____	24
4.1.4	Muziki: Journal of Music Research in Africa _____	28
4.1.5	South African Music Studies (SAMUS) _____	31
4.1.6	Vir die Musiekleier _____	34
4.2	Performing Arts _____	38
4.2.1	South African Theatre Journal (SATJ) _____	38
4.3	Visual Arts _____	42
4.3.1	De Arte _____	42
4.3.2	Image and Text _____	45
4.3.3	South African Journal of Art History _____	48
Appendix A: Questionnaire Sent to Each Editor of Journals being Peer-Reviewed _____		52
Appendix B: Requests to Independent Peer Reviewers _____		55



Acronyms / Abbreviations

AHWG	Arts Historical Work Group
AJOL	African Journals Online
ASSAf	Academy of Science of South Africa
CC	Creative Commons
CELJ	Council of Editors of Learned Journals
CHE	Council on Higher Education
COPE	Committee on Publication Ethics
CPD	Continuous professional development
CSPiSA	Committee on Scholarly Publishing in South Africa
DHET	Department of Higher Education and Training
DOAJ	Directory of Open Access Journals
DST	Department of Science and Technology
EAB	Editorial Advisory Board
EBSCOhost	Elton B Stephens Company (EBSCOhost) Research Databases
ESCI	Emerging Sources Citation Index
HEQC	Higher Education Quality Committee
HESA	Higher Education South Africa (now USAf)
IBSS	International Bibliography of the Social Sciences
IBTD	International Bibliography of Theatre and Dance
IBZ	International Bibliography of Periodical Literature on the Humanities and Social Sciences
IJME	International Journal of Music Education
ILAM	International Library of African Music
INASP	International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications
ISAP	Index to South African Periodicals
ISI	International Scientific Indexing
JMAA	Journal of the Musical Arts in Africa
MEJ	Music Educators Journal
MLA	Modern Language Association
NISC	National Inquiry Services Centre
NRF	National Research Foundation
NSEF	National Scholarly Editors' Forum
NWU	North-West University
OCLC	Online Computer Library Centre

OJS	Open Journal Systems
PRP	Peer Review Panel
RILM	Répertoire International de Littérature Musicale
SABINET	South African Bibliographic and Information Network
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAJAH	South African Journal of Art History
SAKOV	Suider-Afrikaanse Kerkorrelistevereniging
SAMRO	South African Music Rights Organisation
SAMUS	South African Music Studies
SATJ	South African Theatre Journal
SAVAH	South African Visual Arts Historians
SciELO SA	Scientific Electronic Library Online South Africa
UCT	University of Cape Town
UK	United Kingdom
Unisa	University of South Africa
UP	University of Pretoria
USA	United States of America
USAf	Universities South Africa (previously HESA)
WoS	Web of Science Citation Index

Preface

Committee on Scholarly Publishing in South Africa (CSPiSA)

Discipline-grouped Peer-review Reports on South African Scholarly Journals

This is the eighth in the series of discipline-grouped evaluations of South African scholarly journals. Eventually, it is hoped that all scholarly journals in the country will have been subjected to independent, multiple peer review as part of a quality assurance process initiated by the Academy of Science of South Africa (ASSAf). The quality assurance process is a precursor to the identification of journal titles to be loaded on to the open access platform, Scientific Electronic Library Online (SciELO) South Africa. Only open access journals of a sufficiently high quality will be included in this fully indexed, free online, multi-national platform, now also directly featured on Clarivate Analytics' Web of Science portal.

The traditional focus of peer review is on a single journal article, book chapter or book. It is less common to subject journals to independent, multiple peer review, as these are usually evaluated in qualitative, reputational terms, or bibliometrically, by means of impact factors.

The peer review of South African scholarly journal titles thus required the development of a new methodology that was piloted successfully with the first two discipline-grouped peer-review reports, published in 2010, on *the Social Sciences and Related Fields*, and the *Agricultural and Related Basic Life Sciences*. This work was not achieved without difficulty, as the process was unfamiliar to reviewers accustomed to reviewing single articles.

ASSAf has confidence in this ambitious programme, which is aimed at ensuring that the bulk of South African scholarly journals are of a high quality. The process goes beyond the familiar journal assessment approaches mentioned above by providing concrete recommendations to enable the editor(s) of journals, especially those not deemed to be of a sufficient standard, to take corrective action and provides an opportunity for them to reapply for evaluation.

The process centred on multi-perspective, discipline-based evaluation panels appointed by the Academy Council on the recommendation of the Academy's CSPiSA; journal editors were requested to complete specially designed questionnaires, and peer reviewers were selected from a spectrum of scholars in the fields concerned. Each editor was asked to provide answers to a set of questions, which were used to address the scope and focus of the peer-reviewed articles in the journals under review, the authorship generally, and the presence or absence of enrichment features, such as editorials, topical reviews, book reviews, and news and views articles. (The editors' questionnaire and peer reviewers' set of questions are appended to this report.)

Each discipline-based evaluation panel met to discuss the individual peer reviews and questionnaires and consolidated them into a consensus review for each journal. Final formulations and recommendations were prepared, including suggestions for improvement from both the peer reviewers and the panel. The responsible editors were given an opportunity to check the accuracy of the information in each individual journal report, and the final version of the report was submitted for approval to the ASSAf CSPiSA and the Council of ASSAf.

As the latest in the series of reports, it is evident that much has been learned from the previous discipline groups and that, going forward, the process will become more streamlined, such that subsequent reports will follow in rapid succession.

I would like to thank the Chair of the Panel, Prof Hein Viljoen and members of the evaluation Panel, and particularly Prof Robin Crewe, who is responsible for overseeing ASSAf's peer review panels' activities, for his leadership in this quality-assurance process. I acknowledge the important role played by the staff of the Academy in supporting the process; Ms Susan Veldsman, Director of the Scholarly Publishing Unit, and the Project Officers who worked under her direction, namely, Ms Desré Stead and Ms Mmaphuthi Mashiachidi. Ms Patricia Scholtz is thanked for copy-editing. Finally, I acknowledge the contribution of the many individual peer reviewers who have each contributed towards strengthening the quality of South African scholarly journals.

Prof Roseanne Diab

Executive Officer: Academy of Science of South Africa



Foreword

The Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) congratulates ASSAf for yet another discipline-grouped peer-review report. The report is aimed at improving the quality of the journals in our higher education system, thereby influencing the standard of research conducted in the respective fields. It is in the interests of our higher education system and society in general that the quality of research conducted in the system should be continuously improved.

The DHET published the *Research Outputs Policy* (2015) in the *Government Gazette* (Vol 597, No 38552). The policy, which is a revised version of the *Policy and Procedures for Measurement of Research Output of Public Higher Education Institutions* of 2003, came about after almost ten years of implementation of the previous version after a long drawn-out process of studying several publications and a consultative process within and outside the higher education sector.

Three additional journal indices were included over and above the initial three. Further changes include the rule that at least 75% of articles published in a journal must emanate from multiple institutions. Overall, though, the effected changes to the policy were aimed at improving the quality of publications from the higher education system. Based on evidence, the *Policy and Procedures for Measurement of Research Output of Public Higher Education Institutions* of 2003 had managed to increase the quantity of publications from the system. However, as part of analysis of data and patterns, the DHET observed that the quality of some publications was questionable. Thus, the policy encourages all South African journals to aim for international standards in order to apply for inclusion in accredited international lists or indices. A number of studies suggest that predatory journals come about partly because of pressure to publish and to accrue maximum subsidy. As such, the policy reminds institutions and academics of the importance of research integrity, ethics and the essence of knowledge dissemination rather than maximum benefits accompanying publications.

The DHET continues to explore various means of improving the quality of publications and to deal with the scourge of predatory journals. We would like universities to pay serious attention to improving the quality of publications using the known measures employed internationally such as peer review and the accepted norms of scholarship. If need be and as the *Research Outputs Policy* indicates, the DHET will even consider introducing penalties to non-complying institutions. The effort towards improvement of quality in our higher education system is everyone's responsibility.

Mr Mahlubi Mabizela and Ms Fhumulani Maanda
University Education Policy
Department of Higher Education and Training



1 Periodic Peer Review of South African Scholarly Journals: Approved Process Guidelines and Criteria

1.1 Background

During the launch meeting of the ASSAf-led National Scholarly Editors' Forum (NSEF) held on 25 July 2007, the 112 participants supported ASSAf and its CSPiSA in taking the lead in the implementation of Recommendation 5 of the 2006 ASSAf report on *A Strategic Approach to Research Publishing in South Africa*. This recommendation dealt specifically with the need for a system of quality assurance for over 260 of the country's journals which are accredited by the DHET:

Recommendation No 5: that ASSAf be mandated jointly by the Departments of Education and Science and Technology to carry out external peer review and associated quality audit of all South African research journals in five-year cycles, probably best done in relation to groups of titles sharing a particular broad disciplinary focus, in order to make recommendations for improved functioning of each journal in the national and international system.

1.2 ASSAf Peer Review Panels (PRPs)

The quality assurance system for journals is conducted primarily through discipline-grouped peer reviews carried out by a series of purpose-appointed peer review panels (PRPs) drawn from the ranks of researchers and other experienced scholars in and around the fields concerned in each case, as well as persons with practical (technical) publishing experience. The proposed ASSAf PRPs are overseen by the CSPiSA, but appointed by the Academy Council. Their draft reports are sent to relevant stakeholders for comment and input, before finalisation by the PRP concerned, and ultimate consideration sequentially by the CSPiSA and the ASSAf Council.

The following quote from the ASSAf report clarifies the approach to be followed in the review of the journals and some aspects of the approach proposed:

*The periodic, grouped **quality assurance-directed peer review of South African research periodicals** would function analogously to the quality audits of the Council on Higher Education (CHE) and Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC), would be developed as an outcome of the Editors' Forum, and would focus on: the quality of editorial and review process; fitness of, and for purpose; positioning in the global cycle of new and old journals listed and indexed in databases; financial sustainability; and scope and size issues. The **ASSAf panels** carrying out the reviews would each comprise 6 – 8 experts, some of whom would not be directly drawn from the areas concerned, and would require data-gathering, interviews, and international comparisons, before reports with recommendations are prepared, approved, and released to stakeholders such as national associations, the Departments of Science and Technology and of Education, the CHE/HEQC, the NRF and Higher Education South Africa (HESA) now Universities South Africa (USAf)).*

It must be emphasised that the main purpose of the ASSAf review process for journals is to improve the quality of scholarly publication in the country in a manner that is consonant with traditional scholarly practices – primarily voluntary peer review. It is not an attempt to control these publications in any way. ASSAf respects the independence and freedom of researchers and of the research process itself as important preconditions for the critical and innovative production of new knowledge. At the same time, the work of South African researchers has to be assessed, both qualitatively and quantitatively, as part of the global community of scholars and scientists, and in this respect ASSAf has an obligation to contribute to the improvement of quality of such work where possible.

1.3 Initial Criteria

A number of criteria were explored in the part of the ASSAf report <http://research.assaf.org.za/handle/20.500.11911/49> (Chapter 4) that dealt with the survey of the over 200 then-current editors of accredited South African scholarly journals. Other possible criteria were proposed in other sections of the report, or have since been suggested by members of the CSPiSA or the NSEF. These are grouped and listed below, and are consolidated in the questionnaire presented in Appendix A.

1.3.1 Editorial Process-related Criteria: Generally Based on the *National Code of Best Practice in Editorial Discretion and Peer Review* Developed by ASSAf

- Longevity of the journal (continuous or discontinuous), in years.
- Number of original peer-reviewed papers published per year during the last five years, plus number of manuscripts submitted, plus number rejected out-of-hand or after peer review; average length of published papers; and 'author demography' of papers submitted and published.
- Number and nature of peer reviewers used per manuscript and the overall number per year, including institutional and national/international spread, plus quality (as per the *National Code of Best Practice in Editorial Discretion and Peer Review*) and average length of peer-review reports.
- Average delay before publication of submitted manuscripts and frequency of publication.
- Professional stature and experience of the editor; how he/she is selected; how long the editor has been in service; and the success or otherwise in addressing the major issues in the field, through commissioning of reviews/articles, editorial comment, etc.
- Number and professional stature/experience of editorial board members, plus selection processes, turnover, and nature of involvement in handling of manuscripts or in other functions. If international members serve on the board (desirable), whether they are a mix from developed and developing countries.
- Existence and nature of editorial policy/guidelines, plus how often these are revised/updated; conflict-of-interest policy (e.g. how manuscripts are assessed when submitted by an editor or board member as author/co-author).
- *Errata* published – how many per year?
- Value-adding features, such as editorials, news and views pieces, correspondence on papers, reviews, policy/topical fora, etc. – how many, and how are they generated? What proportion are they of the total pages in journal issues?
- Any peer-review process of the journal already in place (e.g. by professional association).

1.3.2 Business-Related Criteria

- Frequency and regularity ('on time') of publication.
- Print runs (redundant stock, direct *versus* indirect distribution to readers).
- Production model and service provider(s).
- Paid and unpaid advertising.
- Sponsorship and *quid pro quos*.
- Paid and unpaid subscription base and how this is marketed. Cost level of print and (if applicable) e-subscriptions.
- E-publication. If this is done, what are the website/portal and access possibilities for users? What evaluation is done, especially in respect of tagging and searchability?
- Whether there are html/xml and PDF versions, or only PDF, and whether multimedia is used.
- The portals for open access, if provided. If not e-published, whether this is being considered, and how.
- Total income and expenditure per annum.
- Distribution to international destinations.
- Indexed in Web of Science (WoS) and/or International Bibliography of Social Sciences (IBSS), or any other international database? If indexed, for how long and how continuously?
- Offers to purchase from multi-national publishers.
- Copyright arrangements.

1.3.3 Bibliometric Assessments

- Citation practice – how many authors are listed?
- If applicable, what are the WoS-type impact factors (and various derivatives) over the last five years?
- Are reviews a regular/increasing feature?
- If articles are not in English, are English abstracts mandatory?

1.4 Process Guidelines for Setting up the Panels, Peer Reviewers, Panel Meetings and Reports for the Subject Peer Review of Journals

1.4.1 Background to ASSAf PRPs

The quality assurance system for journals is implemented primarily through discipline-grouped peer reviews carried out by a series of purpose-appointed PRPs drawn from the ranks of researchers and other experienced scholars in and around the fields concerned in each case, as well as persons with practical (technical) publishing experience. The proposed ASSAf PRPs are overseen by the CSPiSA, but appointed by the Academy Council. Their draft reports are sent to relevant stakeholders for comment and relevant input, before finalisation by the PRP concerned, and final consideration sequentially by the CSPiSA and the ASSAf Council.

1.4.2 Role of the Scholarly Publishing Unit (SPU)

An ASSAf project officer of the SPU is assigned to support each panel chair, but reports to the director of the SPU in terms of review logistics and the production of draft and final review reports. The project officer is responsible for the following issues and activities:

- selecting and appointing panel members;
- obtaining completed questionnaires from editors;
- organising panel activities, including meetings; selecting independent peer reviewers for each journal or groups of titles;
- drafting consolidated version 1 reports; and
- obtaining CSPiSA and ASSAf Council approval for final, publishable panel reports.

1.4.3 Setting up Panels

The proposed PRPs are chaired by an ASSAf Member and appointed by the Council, which assumes accountability for the PRP's work in helping to develop a credible quality assurance mechanism for South African scholarly journals.

1.4.4 Selecting Panel Members

- The appointment process of PRP members is managed by the Chair of the CSPiSA until the panel and its chair have been appointed.
- CSPiSA members are asked to assist in preparing a list of at least 12 – 13 names, of which the last 4 – 5 shall be considered to be potential alternates to the first 7 – 8.
- A typical PRP consists of 6 – 8 members.
- Each name must be accompanied by critical personal and career details, as well as by a brief motivation, to enable the CSPiSA, and later the ASSAf Council, to apply its mind to the question of constituting the best possible, most competent PRP.
- The draft list of potential members is published on the ASSAf website, and is also circulated for comment to members of the NSEF at least two weeks before the Council meeting where the appointments are to be made.
- All comments received will be noted in making the final decision.
- All provisionally listed persons are required to complete and submit conflict-of-interest forms prior to the Council's consideration of the list in question.

1.4.5 Criteria for Membership

- The individuals selected to serve on a PRP should have experience and credibility in the disciplines under review or in related disciplines, or be senior scholars who may be from a completely different discipline. Generally, the composition of a panel, in an approximate ratio of 3:3:2, should be a mix of disciplinary specialists, specialists in areas cognate to the broad disciplinary area concerned, and 'wise people' who are steeped in scholarly practices and drawn from any broad disciplinary area.
- The panel members should have demonstrable expertise and experience in both the editing and peer-review aspects of research journals.

- It is not necessary that all PRP members be experts in both editing and peer-review aspects – a mix of senior academics and a few active editors (of journals not under review) is appropriate – but all should have some appreciation of both editing and peer review.
- At least one member should have direct practical (technical) experience of publishing.

Persons selected as panel participants will typically be drawn from ASSAf's Membership, academic institutions, science councils and consultants.

1.4.6 Conflict of Interest

- It will be necessary to take care to avoid real or perceived conflicts.
- Committee expertise, balance and conflicts of interest are discussed at the first meeting (and may again be discussed at any later meeting) of the PRPs, and recommendations to resolve problematic issues can be brought through the SPU (Secretariat) to the ASSAf Council for possible amendment of the composition of PRPs.
- Panel members are requested to submit written conflict-of-interest statements, and are bound to report any new potential sources of conflicts of interest during the quality review process.

1.4.7 Organising the Panels

The organisation of the panel is conducted by its chair, supported by the assigned project officer. The activities related to organisation typically include:

- Planning and costing the review and panel activities.
- Obtaining completed questionnaires from each editor/equivalent (concerning publishing logistics).
- Identifying suitable peer reviewers for each journal or group of titles (concerning content quality).
- Assembling hard copies of journals or providing access to the journal online.
- Establishing panel meeting dates, assigning tasks, and collating materials.
- Preparing and distributing pre-meeting and post-meeting materials (draft version 1 reports, i.e. assembled peer reviews and editors' questionnaires, in template form).
- Taking responsibility for post-meeting activities, including draft version 2 report preparation, circulation for comment to panellists and editors, and preparation and processing of final reports.
- Evaluation of panel processes.

1.4.8 Selection of Peer Reviewers (See above)

- At least two, but preferably three, independent peer reviewers, as well as alternative reviewers must be agreed upon by the panel for each title or group of similar titles.
- Members of the CSPISA and the ASSAf Membership in general will be given an opportunity to volunteer through a specific written call.
- Other candidates will be sought from lists of the NRF and active science council research staff.
- The process of selection is overseen by the panel chair. The final agreed appointments of willing volunteer reviewers are made by the panel itself.
- Conflicts of interest must be avoided – thus current or former editors cannot become peer reviewers of the journals concerned; this also applies to current members of editorial boards.
- The project officer must arrange access to hard or e-copies of the journals under review by independent experts.
- The core questions to be answered in each case must be provided to peer reviewers, who should be asked to ensure that these questions are all addressed in their reviews.

1.4.9 Panel Meetings and Procedures

Preparations

- The ASSAf project officer is responsible for drawing up the version 1 report on each journal. Each reviewer's answers should be consolidated under the standard headings of the draft; each input as a separate paragraph. The editor's questionnaire should also be inserted as a single item under 'questionnaire' and 'business aspects'.

- The documentation (editors' questionnaires, peer-review reports) should be sent out by email to all panellists at least two weeks prior to the panel meeting.
- Conveners of sub-sets of journals should be alerted at this time to their role at the forthcoming panel meeting – to present the journals in the set, and to make recommendations for discussion and elaboration. If unable to attend, they should be asked to submit written notes for presentation to the panel by the convener.
- Ideally, hard copies of issues of journals to be considered should be available at the meeting, but if logistically impossible, this can be dispensed with.
- A quorum of at least two-thirds of the members of PRPs must be guaranteed at any meeting, otherwise a new date must be sought.
- Panellists should be informed at the same time that hard copies of all documentation will be available at the meeting in bundles containing the completed editor's questionnaire and reviewers' reports for each journal title.
- The responsible project officer should ensure that at least two peer reviews, and preferably three, are in hand for each title by the time of the initial send-out of materials, or, by default, by the date of the meeting, for tabling on the day.

Meeting

- Journal titles should be considered in sub-sets.
- Consensus on each of the criteria should be agreed *seriatim* as per a convener's spoken summary, and noted by the project officer in attendance.
- Particular attention should be paid to reaching agreement on recommendations in respect of:
 - (a) An invitation to the publisher/editor to join the SciELO South Africa platform (if the journal is open access and meets the special criteria on frequency of publication and annual number of original peer-reviewed articles).
 - (b) A recommendation to the DHET on accreditation in its list of South African journals in which any article is considered as a valid research output.
 - (c) If not recommended, suggestions for improvement that would make it possible to make an invitation and/or recommendation under (a) or (b).
 - (d) Suggestions for improvement or enhanced function in general.

1.4.10 Post-meeting Procedures and Panel Reports

- When producing a version 2 report, the three paragraphs in each item have to be consolidated to produce a consensus version.
- A detailed and motivated draft version 2 report of each peer review panel's findings and recommendations is prepared by the assigned project officer, working closely with the panel chair.
- The project officer and convener should reach agreement on the record of the meeting in respect of all outcomes within no more than two weeks.
- The meeting record should be sent for comment and ratification to all panellists (including those who were not able to attend the meeting) and replies should be received within one week.
- The convener should prepare a final version of the meeting record, and submit a copy of each journal-specific item as a privileged communication to the editor concerned for written comment within no more than two weeks.
- The convener should identify any editor's comment that might materially change the recommendations in the record, and submit these to the panel for consideration and decision.
- The finally agreed-upon record should be submitted to the CSPiSA for approval before its submission to the ASSAf Council and public release.

2 Special Considerations Concerning South African Visual and Performing Arts Journals

The primary aim of this discipline-grouped journal peer review is to improve the quality of scholarly publication in this particular field in the country. As the authors stated in the first humanities report, this conversation cannot "be divorced from the progressive marginalisation" of the humanities. The present panel therefore also wants to contribute towards countering this trend and improving the scholarly status of

music, theatre studies and visual arts. The challenge is to develop and maintain a system of academic research that is as vibrant and creative as the music, visual arts and performances that are produced in South Africa. The status of the disciplines is tied dialectically to their perceived social relevance. No journal can be really excellent and fit for its purpose if it is not in conversation with a living local tradition. Part of the peer-review process is to make recommendations that will ensure that such a conversation is maintained and extended.

Journals have to participate in a global conversation if they want to serve their public well and make the research of their authors globally visible. The involvement of authors, advisors and referees from abroad is essential in this context. A journal cannot, however, simply publish articles that imitate or repeat international research but should rather, in conversation with the living local tradition, try to publish research that breaks new ground and that reconfigures the local and the global, challenges global theories and procedures and develops insights relevant to Africa and to the global South. The present debate on decolonisation underscores this challenge, and also the importance of Africa-wide research cooperation. The so-called value-added features of journals such as correspondence and book reviews are vital for becoming part of these conversations.

This peer-review process has again shown the perennial problem of the lack of funding and the inequality of resources available to different kinds of South African journals. Some journals are well supported by big universities and their infrastructure, while others depend heavily on the spare time of their editorial boards and the meagre support their academic societies or departments can give them. Take-overs by, and partnerships with, big commercial concerns can certainly help to solve this problem, but raises the ethical question whether big concerns should make money out of publically-funded research. The panel has made a number of recommendations aimed at improving the viability of this cluster of journals.

There also seems to be a dialectical relation between the desire for greater international visibility and participation in international conversations, and a focus on a useful local niche for a journal. The danger is of course that a niche can be exclusive and restrictive, which contradicts the ideals of openness and inclusivity in scholarly publishing. Focusing on a clearly defined niche does help to differentiate a journal from others and to define its particular contribution. One should also ask whether the present set of journals covers the field optimally and is of an optimal size and scope. To improve the size and scope of the system, the panel recommends in one case that the editorial board consider cooperation or amalgamation with another journal. Good management of a journal by editors and proper governance by editorial boards of sound academic standing remain a prerequisite for a good journal.

The issue of the diversity and representivity of the authors who publish in particular journals came up a number of times. Again, there is a tension between serving the interests of a strongly supportive group of scholars and serving the national interest with good research and contributing to the international conversation. Historically, many journals started out as in-house journals, but it is important that they transcend this limitation in order to participate fully in broader conversations. Diversity in this context also includes publishing the work of young researchers, which is vital for the training of a new generation of scholars and a source of new ideas and approaches. Some journals are doing exemplary work in this regard while others seem to be exclusive mouthpieces for mid-career academics. A diversity of participants can increase the quality of a conversation to a large extent. Younger academics participating in editorial boards can also vitally renew a journal.

The review again emphasises the importance of good editorial processes and sound peer review. Poor language editing, bad proof-reading, poor layout and low-quality images reflect very negatively on a journal, especially an arts journal. The ASSAf *Code of Best Practice* can be a very valuable guide in this regard.

Journal publishing worldwide is changing as print journals become more expensive, yet many scholars remain sceptical of open access publishing. The traditional format of a research article is also coming under scrutiny. As the review indicates, the long-standing contradictions between ASSAf's aspirations for the publishing system and the DHET regulations regarding research incentives remain an obstacle to the optimal development of this cluster of journals as well. It is very important, in the interest of good journal publishing, that these contradictions be resolved as soon as possible. It is also advisable that both

ASSAf and the DHET consider subsidising other forms of scholarly work, especially in the arts and music fields – formats like photo essays, curatorship, and performance-oriented types of publication (such as director's notes, choreographies, etc.).

Some editors and editorial boards would no doubt consider the panel's recommendations as intrusive and as encroaching on their terrain. This is not the panel's intention. All recommendations are made with the aim of improving not only the individual journals, but also journal publishing in this cluster of fields in South Africa as a whole.

Note: The period of review of these journals was from 2012/2013 to 2015, just prior to the new DHET research outputs policy coming into effect.

Panel members who are directly involved with the journals being reviewed did not contribute to the reporting or the recommendations for those particular journals.

3 Panel Members

- I Prof Hein Viljoen (Chairperson), Retired Professor: Afrikaans and Dutch Literature; Research Fellow: Research Unit Languages and Literature, North-West University
- II Prof Rob Kim Baum, Honorary Research Associate, Primary Health Care Directorate, University of Cape Town; Former Chair of Centre for Creative Arts: University of Zululand
- III Prof Kim Berman, Associate Professor: Department of Visual Arts, University of Johannesburg
- IV Prof Leora Farber, Director: Visual Identities in Art and Design Research, Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture, University of Johannesburg
- V Prof Franklin Larey, Head: Piano and Keyboard Studies, South African College of Music, University of Cape Town
- VI Prof Martina Viljoen, Associate Professor: Odeion School of Music, University of the Free State

Director, Scholarly Publishing Unit: Ms Susan Veldsman

Project Officer, Scholarly Publishing Unit: Ms Desré Stead

Project Administrator, Scholarly Publishing Unit: Ms Mmaphuthi Mashiachidi

4 Consensus Reviews of Journals in the Group

4.1 Music

4.1.1 African Music

Focus and scope:

(Purpose of journal, positioning, focus, scope, readership)

African Music is an annual peer-reviewed journal published by the International Library of African Music (ILAM). The journal publishes original articles pertaining to contextualised studies of African music and related arts. Most contributors are ethnomusicologists, but articles by anthropologists, historians, etc. are also published.

It is the only journal in existence in the world that specifically publishes research on African music and music of the African diaspora. It is of great use to scholars of African music from undergraduate through to postgraduate and professional levels thereafter. It is widely recognised as the most authoritative source of research on African music.

The primary target audience is local and international scholars and those with an interest in African music. The journal enjoys wide circulation within South Africa and internationally to university libraries and private individuals.

Editing functions:

(Standing, local institutional spread, international participation)

Consensus review: The high academic status of the former Editor, Associate Editors and Editorial Board is acknowledged. The new Editor is the Director of ILAM and a senior lecturer in Ethnomusicology. It is noted that the geographical representation of the Editorial Board is not diverse enough. However, in attending to this consideration, a broader international involvement and representation from the African continent should be retained.

Questionnaire:

(Editorial process-related criteria)

African Music was established in 1954 and is an annual publication. It can be accessed via ILAM's website (www.ru.ac.za/ilam), which is also linked to the Rhodes University Library. Unfortunately, visit and download records were not available at the time of the review. The journal is available online via open access. Statistics for downloads are available and these reveal an increase in traffic, partly due to the journal being openly accessible. At least 20 countries around the world access the journal. The journal is scheduled to appear on given dates. There was a long hiatus in publishing from 1999 to 2006 because the Editor at the time was semi-retired and could not manage the journal as well. Publication was renewed in 2007 with the appointment of a new Director.

During the review period (2013 to 2015), 22 full articles and 22 book reviews were published. Statistics were not available for the number of manuscripts received during the review period. An average of six manuscripts were rejected without peer review and between six and ten were rejected after peer review. Approximately 20% of peer-reviewed papers had at least one author with a non-South African address.

Three peer reviewers are usually approached for each submitted manuscript. Peer reviewers are selected according to their expertise regarding the content of the article to be reviewed. Peer review is conducted in a 'blind way'. Implementation of valid reviewer critique and article improvement is very rigorous, and peer reviewers receive follow-up information. Reviewer performance is assessed but there is no database for such information. Fifteen peer reviewers were used in one of the three years under review. Of these, 60% were from outside the country. Peer-review reports were accessibly retained in the journal's records. The average period between receipt of a manuscript and its publication is seven to eight months.

The Editor held the position for nine years (since 2007) and retired in 2016. The job of editing ILAM's journal is part of the Director's duties. The Editorial Board handles peer review and advises on editorial policies and practices. The length of office of Editorial Board and Editorial Advisory Board (EAB) members is five years. Members are not appointed competitively; they are selected by the Editor.

The guidelines for authors and reviewers are available on the ILAM website. Guidelines are not aligned with ASSAf's *Code of Best Practice*. There was no conflict-of-interest policy at the time of the review. Since its migration to Open Journal Systems (OJS) there is a conflict-of-interest policy for authors and this is accessible on the newly launched OJS platform. There is a policy for *errata*. Critical editorials, analytical book reviews and correspondence on published articles are some of the value-adding features published in the journal. On average, 85% of the pages in each issue represents peer-reviewed original material.

Content:

(Quality, focus, spread within domain, sample of best work in SA, enrichment features)

Consensus review: The quality of articles published in *African Music* is generally good, although some articles lack critical analysis or reflexive interrogation. A good number of articles are published per annum. However, some authors contribute on a regular basis which leads to a one-sided focus. Also, in terms of contributions it is noted that there could be a better regional balance both from within South Africa itself, as well as throughout the African continent.

It is acknowledged that the book reviews section displays a much broader representation; in this regard, however, it is recommended that the appointment of a separate editor for the audio-visual reviews section might be considered. It is also recommended that the journal consider introducing 'themed' issues. It is noted that some articles on African dance are published; this should be further encouraged, as there is a strong interrelationship between African music and dance. African dance submissions could include both peer-reviewed articles plus audio-visual materials for review.

Essential technical features:

(English abstracts, errata, citation practice, presentation)

Consensus review: The inclusion of abstracts and keywords is now mandatory. The submission guidelines online have also been updated. Citation practice is acceptable and the overall presentation is good. There is good resolution of images which are all used in an ethical matter.

Usefulness in capacity development, and international comparability:

Consensus review: The journal seems to appeal more to an older generation of scholars in the discipline. Publication of valuable research by graduate students and younger staff in the discipline should be encouraged, otherwise there could be a gap once the journal no longer publishes the featured senior African music professors, Andrew Tracey and Dave Dargie. The new Editor has been making concerted attempts at soliciting articles from younger scholars and adopting a developmental approach to publishing articles. However, he has faced several challenges in this regard.

The journal is perceived to be more conservative than other journals in the field (such as *Ethnomusicology*, or *South African Music Studies (SAMUS)*) both locally and abroad. It seems to focus on giving visibility to musical practices from the African content with a particular emphasis on the past.

Business aspects:

(Business-related criteria; Bibliometric assessments)

ILAM publishes the journal, and production and distribution are done in-house. The regular print run is 250 copies. The journal carries advertising but is not financially sponsored. There are 207 paying subscribers (65% are institutional subscribers and 35% are individuals). Page or article-processing fees are not charged. A manual system is used to manage the editorial workflow. Since 2018, the manual system has been augmented by the addition of the OJS. The reason for maintaining both systems in the interim is to familiarise authors and the Editor with the OJS.

The journal did not appear online at the time of the review. The journal is now available online and in hard copies; electronic copies are available upon request. In fact, ILAM has recently finished digitising their entire publication archive and it is available open access via the Rhodes University website. There is a two-year embargo on new editions of the journal. Offers have been made from multi-national publishers to purchase the journal but for historical reasons (and the reason that many publishers do not share the vision of ILAM), ILAM is not prepared to cede control of the journal to an international publisher. ILAM owns the copyright to the journal and there is no licensing agreement with authors, although this is being considered for the near future. The journal is not indexed and therefore has no impact factor. There are altmetric indicators for each article. 'Front details' for papers and English abstracts are not mandatory. This is the first independent peer review of the journal.

Suggested improvements:

Consensus review: A new Editor has taken over editorship of the journal since the review took place. The Editor should consider diversifying the Editorial Board and including young black scholars. The Editorial Board composition should be revised and its terms of office articulated. A dedicated audio-visual reviews editor should be appointed.

While it is commendable that respected senior scholars publish regularly in this journal, more contributions throughout the African continent, as well as international contributions should be encouraged or actively solicited.

It is recommended that the journal include more articles that problematise representational issues, the conceptualisation of African music, politics, power and the production of music for the local and global markets. There should be a balance of articles in each issue so that contemporary and traditional practices are featured in one issue. Other scholarly features such as opinion pieces and reviews of recordings and concerts should be included.

Themed issues on occasion should be considered so that all articles in that particular year have some coherence.

The journal's website could be improved upon in general. It is also recommended that the names of the Editorial Board are featured in a visible, prominent space on the front page of the website. The move to OJS is a step in the right direction.

Licensing agreements with authors should be put in place.

The journal must align its guidelines with ASSAf's *Code of Best Practice*.

Bibliometric assessments should be improved, and the journal should be indexed, so that its performance can be monitored via altmetric indicators.

Panel's consensus view:

- I The journal should continue to be listed on the DHET accredited list.
- II The journal can be invited to join the SciELO South Africa platform.
- III The Editor should seriously consider including broader cultural, geographical and gender diversity and representation with regard to the composition of the Editorial Board.
- IV The Panel believes that in general, some renewal is called for and the Publisher/Editor should seriously consider the recommendations in this review. The journal is commended, however, for having retained its unique focus on the African continent.

4.1.2 *Journal of the Musical Arts in Africa*

Focus and scope:

(Purpose of journal, positioning, focus, scope, readership)

The *Journal of the Musical Arts in Africa* (JMAA) is published by the National Inquiry Services Centre (NISC) in association with the South African College of Music at the University of Cape Town (UCT). It aims to combine ethnomusicological, musicological, music educational and performance-based research in a unique way to promote the musical arts on the African continent. While focusing on specific disciplines and fields the journal encourages cross-disciplinary research within all performing arts and related disciplines. This journal also incorporates book, audio and audio-visual media and software reviews.

The JMAA provides a platform for scholars to discuss issues relating to ethnomusicology, musicology, musical education and performance-based research, specifically highlighting musical arts in South Africa, and in Africa. The content, while alluding to international research hones in finely on African musical arts providing both a theoretical and practical analysis for the South African research community, encapsulating musical arts on the African continent and delving into research within related disciplines.

The content predominantly serves the South African research community as well as those in other parts of Africa. While the content may appeal to scholars further afield, articles have a southern African focus. Regarding submission, the journal's target audiences are based in South Africa as well as the broader African continent. The JMAA is available to readers both in print and online.

Editing functions:

(Standing, local institutional spread, international participation)

Consensus review: The standing of the Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Board members is unimpeachable. Each is a recognised voice in their respective field and between them they cover the broad ambit of

the journal that encompasses musicology, ethnomusicology, African music studies, praxis, pedagogy, and music education. The board is representative of international scholars of the continent and beyond, as well as respectable local scholars but could benefit from the input of black South African scholars.

Questionnaire:

(Editorial process-related criteria)

The *JMAA* was established in 2004. It is published as a single issue per year (which will be increased to two issues). It is available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/rmaa>. In 2014, the journal received more than 12 604 page views (including Issues list, Table of Contents, Abstracts and References page views) and 1 639 full text downloads. The *JMAA* was read in more than 67 countries and 11 different African countries in 2014. It is pre-scheduled to appear in December each year.

There have been no significant interruptions in publication.

Over the three-year review period (2013 to 2015), 12 full articles and 14 book reviews were published. Other articles included Young Researchers' Voices (3), Reports (1), Tributes (1), Composition (3), and Editorials (3). Information was not available on the number of manuscripts received and the rejection rate of the journal was also not available for the review period. The proportion of peer-reviewed papers that had at least one author with a non-South African address was 25%.

Information was not available on the number of peer reviewers usually approached. Reviewers were selected through the journal's network of contacts, including suggestions from the Editorial Board and EAB. The journal follows a 'double-blind' peer-review process. The Editor-in-Chief undertakes extensive post-review editing input and author engagement. The journal also follows a policy where major revisions are referred back to peer reviewers after revision to ensure that content-specific changes indeed took place. Peer reviewers receive follow-up information. Reviewer performance is assessed and information is captured in a database. The total number of peer reviewers used in one year over the review period was 24 (acknowledged in print copy). Fifty per cent of these reviewers were from outside South Africa (some reviewers had joint local and overseas affiliations). Peer-review reports were accessibly retained in the journal's records. Information was not available on the average period between receipt of a manuscript and its publication.

The Editor-in-Chief has been editing the journal since its inception in 2004. The appointment was not competitive and the period of appointment seems indefinite.

The Editorial Board do not usually handle peer review but they do advise on editorial policies and practices. They also provide specific topical expertise. The length of office for members of the Editorial Board and EAB is varied. Members are not appointed competitively but by personal invitation of the Editor-in-Chief. The period of appointment is indefinite. Members are appointed from both inside and outside the country.

The editorial guidelines are available as 'Instructions to Authors' which is available on the journal's website. The publishers (NISC) of the journal have a document entitled Ethical Considerations in Research Publication which is made available on the journal's webpage. This document includes considerations of conflicts of interest. In addition, co-publisher Taylor & Francis (Routledge) is a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Guidelines are aligned with ASSAf's *Code of Best Practice*. It is the publisher's policy to publish *errata*, as per the guidelines. None has proved necessary to date.

Value-adding features include critical editorials and analytical book reviews as a feature of each issue. The journal also publishes reviews of CDs, videos, etc. Other features include Young Researchers' Voices, a continental essay competition which provides a space for emerging scholars from various countries in Africa to publish. The essay competition is intended to promote research, scholarship and good writing about music in Africa amongst undergraduate and honours students, thus allowing up-coming researchers and scholars in Africa to be recognised. Each issue also contains an analysis of a contemporary composition, including a recording of the full composition.

At least 90% of the content in each issue represents peer-reviewed original material.

Content:

(Quality, focus, spread within domain, sample of best work in SA, enrichment features)

Consensus review: The articles, compositions, and reviews published in this journal are of fair to good quality in terms of substance and scope, and present a wide range of disciplinary perspectives from established and younger scholars. There are a good number of articles per annum. There is good balance in terms of content with both ethnographic and historical approaches.

An issue which the journal should consider, though, is that it displays a regional focus that does not reflect broader musicological and ethnomusicological discourses. This is attributed to the fact that most of the authors are South African-based.

The inclusion of scores and multimedia are welcomed, as well as the inclusion of compositions, though in this regard it was noted that only hard-copy readers could access these. It is considered a positive point that the volumes under review are clustered and thematically related.

Essential technical features:

(English abstracts, errata, citation practice, presentation)

Consensus review: All the articles have abstracts in English that conform to international standards. No *errata* were observed. The articles and other content reviewed do include comprehensive citations. It is a journal that is pleasing to read. The cover is especially compelling for its visual impact. Aspects of presentation, design and layout are well handled and make for an accessible and legible journal. In general, the presentation of the material is professional and meets high standards.

Usefulness in capacity development, and international comparability:

Consensus review: The *JMAA* encourages young scholars by publishing the work of outstanding honours students, as well as graduate students. This is to be encouraged, as long as the content remains of high quality.

The journal compares favourably to a wide range of international journals that serve to publish compelling work of a national or regional nature. The journal is unusual in the sense that it incorporates perspectives from musicology, ethnomusicology, composition, and music education (less so music theory and analysis). This makes it difficult to compare with other journals whose scope is narrower. It is therefore difficult to see how *JMAA* will be able to compete with niche journals in education, musicology and ethnomusicology as long as it accepts so broad a swathe of articles, and so many articles that are focused on South African content without a larger theoretical agenda.

Business aspects:

(Business-related criteria; Bibliometric assessments)

The journal is owned by the South African College of Music and is co-published under licence by NISC and Taylor & Francis (Routledge). Articles that have been edited are placed online when they are publication ready and published in hard copy once per year. Its regular print run is 50 copies per issue. All production is handled in-house by NISC. The journal carries advertising but this is unpaid. There is currently no financial sponsorship. Paying subscribers are from 13 African countries and 27 countries further afield. More than 2 000 institutions have access through Taylor & Francis (Routledge) packages. All subscribers, except one, are organisations. There are no page or article-processing charges. A manual system is used to manage editorial workflow. The journal is part of a commercial e-publication service and is not open access. However, authors can select to have their individual articles published open access for a fee. Although the journal is published by a multi-national publisher, the South African College of Music retains ownership.

Submission of a manuscript implies the transfer of the copyright for the accepted article to the publisher and all media that the journal considers suitable for the dissemination of the work. However, the author

retains the right to disseminate their own work, subject to standard restrictions. Standard publishing involves copyright transfer to the publisher. However, copyright retention licences are available to meet funder requirements and on author request. Authors may elect to publish under a paid open access license that uses restricted Creative Commons (CC) licenses. Special publishing agreements are used for musical compositions, ensuring that the composer/artist retains copyright.

The journal is indexed on Clarivate Analytics (previously Thomson Reuters) Arts and Humanities Citation Index, *Répertoire International de Littérature Musicale* (RILM) Abstracts of Music Literature, Music Index Online and Scopus. The Thomson Reuters Arts and Humanities Citation Index does not produce an impact factor as humanities journals are not well cited. However, the Scopus equivalent Impact Factor was 0.182 for 2014. Data such as number of views per article are available via the journal's web page. Altmetric scores are also available for the journal articles. 'Front details' for papers and English abstracts are mandatory. This is the journal's first independent peer review, although the journal had to undergo rigorous scrutiny by Thomson Reuters.

Suggested improvements:

Consensus review: The ambitious scope of the journal should be closely monitored so that it does not result in a lack of focus. The Editor should be aware of the fact that the strategy to include numerous fields and sub-fields might potentially prohibit the journal from competing with international 'niche' journals focusing exclusively on education, musicology, or ethnomusicology.

[Note: The Editor states that the *JMAA* has a deliberate intention to avoid being 'discipline specific'. There is furthermore a growing international trend to try and combine different sub-disciplines in a conscious attempt to foster new knowledge systems that address the complex nature when different disciplines meet. Placing articles from different disciplines in one journal is not only meeting the 'decolonised' notion of treating 'the performing arts' as a singular concept, but is also contributing to the opening of further avenues that scholars can explore in order to come to a better understanding of people, philosophies, theories and pedagogical frameworks that influence and/or govern them.]

The Editor-in-Chief should consider developing a succession plan for the future stability of the journal. A strategy should be in place to share editorial responsibility, especially as the journal plans to move to two issues per annum; perhaps a practice of guest editorships.

Associate Editors could be more involved and ideally, the journal should consider appointing an ethnomusicologist and music theorist as associate editors as well, at the same time keeping in mind issues of diversity. Though, this should be carefully considered.

[Note: According to the Editor, since 2016 a contingency plan was put into place with the appointment of a second Editor-in-Chief and the expansion of the Associate Editorship to include four to five editors. Younger researchers are invited to participate as co-editors of, for example, the Composition and Reviews section in a further attempt to enable the longevity of *JMAA*. Editors for specific articles are chosen based on the expertise of an editor and guest editors have been appointed per issue to edit specific articles.]

It is strongly recommended that the journal actively and aggressively recruit more black South African voices as contributing authors and Editorial Board members. The absence of these voices in force could become a glaring omission in otherwise sterling work as the journal moves on from its formative decade.

Scores should be included as part of the composition section and made available to online users as well. Compositions from the folk/popular/traditional world should also be included, not only those from an art music paradigm. At present the composition section is relatively autonomous and does not always speak to other issues in the journal. The composition essays are all relatively concise and do not have the same academic standing or rigour as those published as accredited articles. To have musicologists, ethnomusicologists and music theorists engage with the compositions would be a welcome development and would serve to de-segregate the journal.

[Note: The Editor has noted that the publication of scores of compositions could potentially infringe on the copyright of composers, who are only asked for License to Publish of the recording. Readers are free to contact the composers for a score of a composition. Since 2015, samples of all compositions, previously accessible only on the disc shipped with the printed copy, are available (retrospectively) from the journal's website.]

Considering the fact that analytical approaches to African music (inclusive of popular, art and indigenous traditions) have expanded rapidly in recent years, more music-theoretical articles might be included. This would also enable a more productive engagement with composition.

[Note: Since the completion of the ASSAf review process, the journal has already started to reflect on its pan-African scope as the majority of articles published in the last three years were from authors outside southern Africa.]

Panel's consensus view:

- I The journal should continue to be listed on the DHET accredited list.
- II The journal cannot be included on the SciELO South Africa platform. Inclusion would only be possible if the business relationship between the journal and Taylor & Francis (Routledge) were to change.
- III The Editor should seriously consider extending the scope beyond South and southern African music and cultures by engaging scholars from abroad.
- IV In addition, the Panel believes that, if the broad focus of the journal is to be retained, the Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Board should consider the appointment of specialists as associate editors in each of the fields covered by the journal.

4.1.3 *Musicus*

Focus and scope:

(Purpose of journal, positioning, focus, scope, readership)

Musicus is a journal for the furtherance of excellence in music teaching by advancing interest and study in music and music education. The journal focuses on music and also includes articles in which an interdisciplinary approach (e.g. education, psychology, philosophy and sociology) has been adopted by the authors.

Musicus is the only music journal in South Africa with a focus on music education. The journal provides a platform for the publication of research on music in South Africa, as well as southern Africa. The content of the research published in the journal, while focusing on local content, has a global impact.

The primary target audiences are local and international scholars, music educators and music practitioners.

The journal is published by Unisa Press and is distributed nationally and internationally.

[Note: The review period for this journal was from 2011 to 2013.]

Editing functions:

(Standing, local institutional spread, international participation)

Consensus review: A problem pointed out by more than one reviewer is the fact that *Musicus* resides in an administrative division at Unisa and not an academic department (this is confirmed by the questionnaire data). The new Editor-in-Chief is a musicologist and music theorist with university-teaching experience. The members of the Advisory (not Editorial) Board are all noted South African scholars, while the two international members also enjoy high status within their discipline. However, according to the questionnaire data, the role of the Board seems to be limited to advice on practical or administrative matters, rather than involving active engagement with the journal's content, focus and scope.

Questionnaire:

(Editorial process-related criteria)

The journal was established in 1973 and received DHET accreditation in 2006. It was a bi-annual publication until 2016 when the publication frequency was changed to one issue per annum. The journal is available to Sabinet subscribers online and to Unisa staff and students via the university's website: www.unisa.ac.za (See library, ejournals). There were 46 visitors to the site in one year. Visitors are from seven countries around the world (including four African countries).

Issues are not pre-scheduled to appear on given dates. There has been a significant interruption in publication since no issues have been published since 2013. The 2014 issue is near completion.

Over the three-year review period, 15 articles and two book reviews were published. The journal also publishes 'Chronicles' (interviews with composers), names of winners of music competitions and music exam merit prize winners. There were 25 articles received in the same period.

Four manuscripts were rejected without peer review. Two manuscripts were rejected without peer review because the articles were already published in another journal. Ten were rejected after peer review.

The journal did not publish articles by authors from outside the country. Two peer reviewers are approached to review each manuscript and a 'double-blind' peer-review process is followed. Peer reviewers are selected based on their expertise. Given the highly specialised foci of the articles submitted, reviewers are sourced from a specialised pool. For example, a reviewer who is not only familiar with research in early childhood development, but also how this applies to pedagogy for technique on the violin or cello. Authors must attend to all valid reviewer recommendations, required corrections and comments before the article will be reconsidered for publication. In cases where the reviewer required a resubmission, the revised article was resubmitted to the reviewer for feedback. Reviewer performance was assessed and information has been captured in a database since 2015 when the journal was migrated to the Unisa online journal management system. Eighteen peer reviewers were used in one of the three years in the review period. None of these had non-South African addresses. All peer-review reports and complete email correspondences are archived electronically (file folders) and in hard copies.

The average period between receipt of a manuscript and its publication in print is approximately 24 weeks.

The previous Editor-in-Chief was in the position for four years at the time the questionnaire was completed. A new Editor-in-Chief was appointed towards the end of 2015. The editorship of *Musicus* is the responsibility of the Deputy Director (Professional) in the Directorate Music Unisa. This is a permanent position.

The Editorial Board advises on editorial policies and practices but does not handle peer review. The length of office of the Editorial Board is five years. The EAB members are not formally appointed; however, the Director and subject specialist in the Directorate Music, Unisa serve in an advisory capacity for the journal. Further, Unisa's Journal Senate Committee has advisory and management oversight. The EAB comprises two international and four national members. The Board provides specific topical expertise.

Musicus has editorial guidelines which have been aligned to ASSAf's *Code of Best Practice*. There is no formal policy for conflict of interest; however such conflicts are managed and prevented. The journal has a policy for publishing *errata*. The journal occasionally publishes book reviews but no other value-adding features.

Only 35 to 40% of pages in the first edition of the year represents peer-reviewed material because it includes prize winner information. Approximately 90% of pages in the second edition of the year represents peer-reviewed original material.

Content:

(Quality, focus, spread within domain, sample of best work in SA, enrichment features)

Consensus review: The journal operates more as a magazine and newsletter for the department where it is based. The Editorial Board should make a decision on whether the journal should function as a newsletter for the Unisa practical examinations division or whether it should function as a fully-fledged scholarly journal. It cannot be both.

It is stated explicitly that a clearer definition is needed of the disciplinary scope the journal seeks to represent. The questionnaire data create the impression that the Editors are hard-pressed for publishable material, and therefore publish materials outside of the scope of music education and pedagogy. It is noted that this strategy weakens the journal's scholarly credibility. There is a serious problem concerning the frequency of published issues; the most recent issue of the supposedly biannual journal appeared in 2013.

Some of the articles regarding South African arts curricula and their implementation are relevant and interesting within South African music education studies locally; some deal with instrumental teaching and research on many aspects of this, similar to international journals like *International Journal of Music Education* (IJME), and *Music Educators Journal* (MEJ). The articles are, however, uneven in their location in specific research and theoretical paradigms and some are not rigorous in an academic sense. The journal is considered not to be a sampling of the best work done in music education in South Africa, which *Musicus* states as its main disciplinary area. The journal, particularly in its issues pre-2012, usually contains articles by the same set of authors, which contributes to the local and inward-looking character of the journal. The fact that the journal has fallen behind on its publication schedule is viewed in a most serious light.

The journal published two book reviews in one issue; with the exception of the editorials, these were the only additional features in the three-year review period.

Essential technical features:

(English abstracts, errata, citation practice, presentation)

Consensus review: The abstracts for the articles are not effective journal article abstracts, but rather summaries. The issues under review did not contain *errata*. Some errors were observed in the in-text referencing in a few articles. Otherwise, citation practice is acceptable.

The layout and design give the journal more of a magazine rather than a scholarly quality. The general appearance of the journal reflects its origins as a non-peer-reviewed magazine, carrying news and other contributions relevant to Unisa's graded music examinations.

Usefulness in capacity development, and international comparability:

Consensus review: If *Musicus* could overcome its challenges posed by editorial, production, and peer-review issues, and those concerning its consistency of standard, it could play a significant role in encouraging rigorous scholarship and capacity building in the field of music pedagogy in southern Africa.

Given the journal's hybrid character and uneven quality of content, however, it cannot compare with leading international journals in the field.

Business aspects:

(Business-related criteria; Bibliometric assessments)

Unisa is the legal owner of the journal and it resides in the Directorate Music, Unisa. The journal was published by Unisa Press until the hiatus in publishing. Approximately 180 copies are printed per edition. Production and distribution are handled in-house by Unisa Press. No advertising is carried. The journal is not financially sponsored. There are 64 paying institutional subscribers. No fees are charged for publishing in the journal.

An Online Management System is used to manage the editorial workflow. *Musicus* is accessible online for paid subscribers through Sabinet. *Musicus* has not received any offers to purchase.

With regard to copyright, all work is the original work of authors. Sources are acknowledged appropriately. There is no licensing agreement with authors. Any requests from authors to republish their work are handled by Unisa Press.

The journal is not indexed and has no impact factor. Altmetric indicators are gleaned from Sabinet reports. There are 'front details' for papers and mandatory English abstracts. This is the journal's first independent peer review.

Suggested improvements:

It should be noted that there has been a delay in publishing and no issues have appeared since 2013. The frequency of the journal has since been changed to one issue per annum. The backlog is being addressed and the Editor-in-Chief has expressed commitment to getting the journal's publication schedule back on track.

Consensus review: The Panel acknowledges that a new Editor-in-Chief with a more dedicated focus on the journal has been appointed.

It is evident that the Editor-in-Chief and Advisory Board of this journal need to take principled decisions on whether this journal should be upgraded to a sustainable accredited journal that specialises in pedagogical studies, or whether it should perhaps be consolidated with Unisa's *Muziki* journal, so that *Musicus* would function simply as a music examinations newsletter.

[Note: According to the current Editor, the journal's focus has been on music education, but this focus will have to be changed to include articles on other aspects of music, particularly from other countries in Africa. Greater consultation with the Editorial Board will need to take place in order to address this change.

The Editor-in-Chief will recommend to the Editorial Board that non-academic material be removed from the journal and be published in a separate publication. Although the Directorate Music, where *Musicus* resides, is an administrative department, the core business of the Examinations Division of the Directorate Music is academic.]

The journal should consider the establishment of an Editorial Board comprising local and international experts who have published in the field of music education. This Board should, unlike the current Advisory Board, be involved concretely in the composition of each edition, in developing a clearer disciplinary vision for the journal, and in establishing the scholarly networks necessary to ensure quality peer review.

[Note: The Editor-in-Chief has agreed that this is a priority and has already approached the Human Resources Department to appoint a suitable candidate to assist with departmental duties in order to focus on getting *Musicus* back on track.]

Production challenges with Unisa Press should be resolved, or the journal should consider a completely online publication. Taking into account serious production problems that have persisted over the past few years, production by way of e-publication should be considered. The inconsistent quality of published articles should be addressed.

[Note: Unisa Press will no longer publish the journal due to the backlog of issues. The journal will be published by the Directorate Music.]

Attempts should be made to encourage international scholars to contribute articles. Invitations to submit articles should be extended to universities in southern Africa and the African continent in order to broaden the scope of the journal.

Panel's consensus view:

- I The journal should not continue to be listed on the DHET list of accredited journals if it is unable to resolve all administrative and technical problems listed in the report within a period of two years.
- II The journal should not be invited to join the SciELO South Africa platform; this is not advisable within the journal's current context.
- III The Editor-in-Chief should seriously consider involving the Advisory Board in a far more active, possibly mentoring role in order to raise the scholarly profile of this journal, including active involvement in raising the level of the journal content.
- IV In addition, the Panel believes that, under the right conditions this journal could fulfil an important role in the country. However, the Editor-in-Chief and Advisory Board of this journal need to take principled decisions on whether *Musicus* should be upgraded to a sustainable accredited journal that specialises in pedagogical studies, or whether *Musicus* should function as a Unisa music examinations mouthpiece, with some scholarly content added – in which case it should not retain accredited status.

4.1.4 *Muziki: Journal of Music Research in Africa*

Focus and scope:

(Purpose of journal, positioning, focus, scope, readership)

Focused primarily on African music research, *Muziki: Journal of Music Research in Africa* welcomes scholarly articles and reviews of books, music, and recordings related to musical theory and practice of the African continent and beyond. The journal provides a platform for established and emerging scholars in the fields of performance practice, ethnomusicology, and 'traditional' musicology, as well as jazz and popular music studies encompassing diverse aspects of local, diasporic, and global research.

Muziki succeeded the long-established *Ars Nova* journal of the Musicology Department at Unisa in 2004.

The journal aims to capture local and diasporic research, as well as global research of relevance to the South African research community and beyond. The journal has a large African authorship and readership community, and benefits from a wider international authorship and readership base. *Muziki's* target audience is music scholars and practitioners based in Africa or internationally where the research contribution is of relevance to Africa.

Muziki is available to readers in both print and online, and through various subsidiaries.

Editing functions:

(Standing, local institutional spread, international participation)

Consensus review: The (previous) Editor-in-Chief is a NRF-rated researcher with a considerable number of international publications. A new Editor-in-Chief took over editorship from 2016. The newly reconstituted Editorial Committee represents the interests of music departments from four South African universities, and most have experience with research publications apart from the journal. The Editorial Board has members of high international standing.

Questionnaire:

(Editorial process-related criteria)

The journal was established in 1969 as *Ars Nova* but it changed its title to *Muziki* in 2004. It is a biannual publication. It is available online: www.tandfonline.com/rmuz. *Muziki* had 4 177 full-text article downloads and 33 878 page views online over the review period. Readers from 106 countries including 23 African countries accessed the journal. The journal is available to approximately 30 institutional subscribers and 346 institutions and libraries in South Africa and the rest of Africa respectively. In addition, *Muziki* is available to 1 854 institutions and libraries as part of the Taylor & Francis (Routledge) sales deals. These figures also include access via EBSCOhost and development initiatives such as the International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications (INASP) and Research4Life.

It is pre-scheduled to appear in May and December each year and the two issues have appeared on schedule. There have been no significant interruptions to publication.

Over the review period, 56 full articles and two book reviews were published. Taylor & Francis (Routledge) are now encouraging a certain number of pages per issue and that means innovation through book reviews or letters will have to be considered. As for the number of articles received, there were 58 full articles. No figure was available for the number of articles rejected before peer review. However, articles with faulty arguments, poor research methods and unsubstantiated claims were rejected. Once a paper had been preliminarily accepted, authors often worked hard to effect the changes suggested by evaluators, so as a result only two papers were rejected after peer review. About 50% of articles are by authors from outside the country (Kenya, Nigeria and Zimbabwe).

Two peer reviewers are approached for each submitted manuscript. Selection is made on the basis of subject-specific expertise. *Muziki* operates a 'double-blind' peer-review process. The adoption of the ScholarOne platform in 2016 has been instrumental in streamlining the review process. The current *status quo* is that the Editor deals with all the feedback by email. Recently, the Editor is inclined to immediately desk reject articles that demonstrate weaknesses in argumentation. Peer reviewers are apprised of the outcomes of the reviews. Normally reviewer performance is assessed by the Editor especially when reviewers do not submit their reports on time. The Editor has always exercised the prerogative not to use the same reviewer. The journal intends to engage an administrative assistant who will assist the Editor with the ScholarOne Manuscripts portal.

At least 20 peer reviewers were used in one year of the three-year review period. Approximately 20% to 40% had non-South African addresses. Peer-review reports were accessibly retained in the journal's records. The average period between receipt of a manuscript and its publication is between four to six months for both print and online publications.

The current Editor volunteered for the position and has been in service first as Co-Editor in 2014 and then Editor-in-Chief in 2016. The period of appointment is unspecified. The Editorial Board members form part of the journal's pool of reviewers. The Board also advises on editorial policies and practices especially in matters relating to the expansion of the Editorial Board. The Editorial Board has been in operation since 2004. A reconstituted Editorial Committee was established in 2016. EAB members are not appointed competitively but are invited to serve as editorial members. The length of service is unspecified. Members are from inside and outside South Africa. They provide specific topical expertise.

Muziki has detailed 'Instructions for Authors' online which gives information on the journal's editorial policy and guidelines:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/action/authorSubmission?journalCode=rmuz20&page=instructions>. Taylor & Francis (Routledge) is a member of COPE. All of the Taylor & Francis (Routledge) journals, including *Muziki*, abide by the COPE guidelines on publication ethics. The guidelines of the journal are not necessarily aligned with ASSAf's *Code of Best Practice* but with the policy framework of the DHET.

There is a policy to publish *errata*, as per the guidelines: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/publication/corrections.asp>.

Critical editorials, topical reviews and analytical book reviews are the value-adding features published in the journal. Generally 95% of the pages in each issue represent peer-reviewed original material.

Content:

(Quality, focus, spread within domain, sample of best work in SA, enrichment features)

Consensus review: The quality of the articles accepted is inconsistent. A point of particular concern is that some articles demonstrate crass essentialist assumptions or adopt a strongly admonishing tone. The quality of academic writing should receive considerably more attention.

The three volumes under review make for an average of almost 20 articles per annum, which is contextually a very impressive number.

On a positive note, one of the most important elements of the journal is the fact that it allows for in-depth exploration of subjects and genres that are locally and regionally relevant. This includes a very strong level of engagement with problems in music pedagogy in Africa, a topic worthy of intellectual critique at this level.

More frequent inclusion of both editorials and reviews would be appropriate for this journal. There is strong potential for engaging with and stimulating dialogue between music scholars working in South Africa and beyond through this journal. Scholarly correspondence is especially encouraged. Reviews of recordings might also be worth considering. Additionally, the journal should encourage book reviews of authors further afield.

Essential technical features:

(English abstracts, errata, citation practice, presentation)

Consensus review: The quality of the abstracts should be consistent and follow a standard abstract format. There is no publication of *errata*. Overall, citation is clear and evident throughout.

It is not clear whether or not images are used in an ethical manner. For example, in the article on Sengunya Dance (Vol. 12.2, 2015), none of the photos is credited. There are some problems with grammar and language throughout which should be improved through better copy-editing.

Usefulness in capacity development, and international comparability:

Consensus review: This journal is deemed very important for stimulating local graduate/young staff dialogue in musicology and ethnomusicology, particularly on the national level. It seems to be used as a space for early career publication, and also as an important overview of current research in the field.

Given the variability of the quality of the articles published during the period under review, the journal is not comparable to leading international journals in the field. A much more rigorous editorial policy needs to be in place with standardised guidelines of acceptable practice. It would be competitive internationally if the recommended improvements are made.

Business aspects:

(Business-related criteria; Bibliometric assessments)

Unisa Press is the legal owner of *Muziki*, and Taylor & Francis (Routledge) is the co-publisher. The Taylor & Francis (Routledge) United Kingdom (UK) print run is 50 copies and Unisa Press prints 100 copies per issue for distribution in Africa.

No advertising is carried in the journal. The journal does not receive financial sponsorship. No page charges or article-processing fees are charged.

An Online Management System to manage the editorial workflow was implemented in 2016. The journal is held behind a pay wall and individuals and institutions need to take out a subscription in order to be able to access the journal's content. Since *Muziki* is an Open Select title, all authors publishing in *Muziki* are given the option to pay a processing charge and publish their papers open access if they so desire. There are also substantial discounts for authors at institutions in sub-Saharan Africa. Unisa Press retains ownership of the journal.

It is a condition of publication that authors assign copyright or license the publication rights in their articles, including abstracts, to Unisa Press. This enables Taylor & Francis (Routledge) to ensure full copyright protection and to disseminate the articles, and the journal, to the widest possible readership in print and electronic formats. Authors retain many rights under the Taylor & Francis (Routledge) rights policies, which can be found at: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/copyright.asp>.

Muziki is indexed in Current Abstracts and Humanities International Index and was included in Scopus in 2017. Scopus regarded it as "an impressive journal that appears to be in rude health, from the editorial policy and the homepage to the production schedule and online access. Articles are being reasonably well-cited, which is an indication of the importance of the journal in its research field". There is no impact factor at this stage. The journal records the number of full-text article downloads on the journal's website along with the number of citations the journal articles have received.

There are mandatory 'front details' for papers and English abstracts. The journal has not been independently reviewed before.

Suggested improvements:

Consensus review: The Editor should seriously consider more intensive scrutiny of article submissions, as the inconsistent quality of contributions came up as a recurring point of critique in the reviewer reports. Shortcomings need to be addressed on the level of language editing and attention to technical detail (such as bibliographies).

The journal would be improved with more careful attention to clear and error-free writing. If possible, following peer review, a copy editor should review each article with this and only this in mind.

ASSAf's best practice guidelines need to be implemented.

All images should be credited.

The Editor is encouraged to include scholarly correspondence of some kind, since *Muziki* could provide a rich forum for discussion across the broad musical and geographic interests of the scholarly community. Consider incorporating reviews of recordings, as well as book reviews.

More frequent inclusion of reviews (at least once a year) and editorials would raise the journal's level of scholarly engagement. Consider including an editorial at the start of every volume.

Encourage authors to flesh out the context (either intellectual or topic-specific) in the articles. This is particularly important for the abstracts.

Panel's consensus view:

- I The journal should continue to be listed on the DHET accredited journal list.
- II The journal should be invited to join the SciELO South Africa platform, provided that the business relationship with Taylor & Francis (Routledge) were to change.
- III In addition, the Panel believes that despite its positive contribution as a platform for scholarly work in diverse fields of musicology in Africa, *Muziki* is not comparable with leading international journals in the field. It is recommended that a more rigorous editorial policy be put in place with standardised guidelines of acceptable practice, which will ensure a more consistent standard of quality.

4.1.5 South African Music Studies (SAMUS)

Focus and scope:

(Purpose of journal, positioning, focus, scope, readership)

South African Music Studies (SAMUS) gives priority to the publication of research on South African music, but continues to represent the wider field of research interests in the country and in the rest of Africa.

The journal invites work from any of the sub-disciplines in music studies, including musicology, ethnomusicology, popular music studies, music theory and music education. It also publishes work that draws connections between music and other fields in the arts and humanities.

Although much theoretically engaged research on South African and African music is internationally significant, the journal provides what is regarded as a space of critical reconfiguration of the local in relation to the global. By aligning publication criteria regarding content to South African interests, the journal invites content that might struggle to find publication outlets elsewhere in the world, not because of the quality of the research, but because of its deemed relevance to scholarly agendas in the global North.

The primary target audience are the members of the South African Society for Research in Music (SAS-RIM), residing in South Africa and abroad.

[Note: The review period for this journal was from 2011 to 2013.]

Editing functions:

(Standing, local institutional spread, international participation)

Consensus Review: The current Editors have only been appointed since 2015 and the delayed volume 34/35 is their first. However, previous volumes (i.e. 2013 and earlier) reflect the international disciplinary reputations and standing of the Editorial Board. The current Editors have high national disciplinary reputations; the majority of the members of the Editorial Board are also of high international scholarly standing.

Questionnaire:

(Editorial process-related criteria)

SAMUS, an annual publication, was established in 1981. It is available online: <http://www.sasrim.ac.za/index.php?page=3>. The visit and download record was unavailable at the time of the review. The exact details of readership are unknown. However, *SAMUS* is available on African Journals Online (AJOL), as well as other databases such as SA-ePublications, SABINET and EBSCOhost. Libraries that subscribe to the journal in print are located in South Africa, United States of America (USA), UK, Germany and Finland. Exact details of African readership beyond South Africa are unknown. There are 115 individual subscribers of which seven are international individuals.

It is not pre-scheduled to appear on given dates but it is generally the aim to publish a new volume at the end of each year. Publication of Volume 34/35 has been delayed.

In the last three volumes, 17 full articles, two review articles, two book reviews and one conference paper were published. There were 21 'other' articles. Approximately 24 full articles were received. Three full articles were rejected without peer review and four were rejected after peer review. All the authors were South African. However, several non-peer-reviewed responses by international authors were accepted for publication.

Normally two peer reviewers are used for each manuscript. Peer reviewers are selected on the basis of their familiarity with the topic and their standing in the field. Peer review is conducted in a 'blind way'. Authors are required to indicate specifically how points of critique have been addressed in subsequent revisions. Revisions are checked against the original reviewers' reports. Peer reviewers receive follow-up information in cases where revisions were required or when reviewers differed substantially in their assessments. Reviewer performance is not formally assessed. A total of 23 peer reviewers were used in one year in the review period. Ten reviewers were not South African. Peer-review reports were accessibly retained for future reference. There is generally a period of between 12 and 14 months between receipt of a manuscript and its publication (print and online).

The Editor-in-Chief has held the position since 2015. The appointment was competitive and the period of appointment was for three years. The Editorial Board handles peer review and advises on editorial policies and practices. Its length of office is four years. The Board was not appointed competitively. Members were appointed for five years and are from inside and outside South Africa. They provide specific topical expertise.

Information about the editorial process is available on the journal's website. *SAMUS* endorses the standards of the COPE. There is no formal conflict-of-interest policy but conflicts are handled between the Editors. Guidelines are aligned with ASSAf's *Code of Best Practice*. There is a policy in place for publishing *errata*.

The following value-adding features are published: critical editorials; news and views analyses of articles; critical topical reviews; analytical book reviews; and, correspondence on published articles. Other features include DVDs, CDs, score fold-outs and critical responses.

The percentage of peer-reviewed original material published in the journal differs from volume-to-volume.

Content:

(Quality, focus, spread within domain, sample of best work in SA, enrichment features)

Consensus review: Articles published in the last three volumes (2011 to 2013) are of a consistently high quality. Some of these are ambitious in aim and outlook, and therefore suggest disciplinary significance. *SAMUS* represents a good sample of the best work done in South Africa. The same cannot be said for the best work in the field. This comment should not be read as a criticism since *SAMUS* deliberately includes content from a commendably wide range of music subdisciplines, as well as work that makes connections between music and other fields in the arts and humanities (which is regarded as a strength of the journal).

The Editor's statement that *SAMUS* aims to provide 'a space of critical reconfiguration of the local in relation to the global' seems borne out in the issues that were reviewed. So whilst *SAMUS* predominantly considers regional materials and challenges, such is the nature of the musical environment of South Africa that this ought to provide some very interesting insights internationally.

Essential technical features:

(English abstracts, errata, citation practice, presentation)

Consensus review: Proper abstracts in English have been published for all articles. There was no publication of *errata* which points at very serious editorial work. The citation practice is consistently applied. The presentation, layout, design and copy-editing are good. The majority of photographic images are credited, but there are a few exceptions.

Usefulness in capacity development, and international comparability:

Consensus review: The great majority of articles published in *SAMUS* can serve as an ongoing stimulus for local graduate students and young staff in scholarship on music. Being oriented almost exclusively on the topics of recent or current state of musical affairs within the South African society, *SAMUS* has no international match as such; on the other hand, when compared with some other leading predominantly nationally-oriented journals in Europe, *SAMUS* may be classified among the most original ones, publishing articles almost completely devoted to musical contemporaneity. In the quality of most of its articles, its editorial policy and its interdisciplinary approach to envisaged research problems, *SAMUS* can match leading international journals in its field.

Business aspects:

(Business-related criteria; Bibliometric assessments)

SASRIM owns and publishes the journal. Its regular print run is 150 copies. Production is outsourced to SUN MeDIA, Stellenbosch. No advertising is carried in the journal. Funding is received from the South African Music Rights Organisation (SAMRO). There were 128 paying subscribers (115 individuals and 13 organisations (agents)). The journal does not charge page or article-processing fees. The editorial workflow is managed via a manual system. It is not an open access journal but it is part of a commercial e-publication service. *SAMUS* has had offers to purchase from multi-national publishers but no details were provided. Copyright resides with the author and there is a licensing agreement.

The journal is indexed in ProQuest, Gale, EBSCOhost, RILM, Sabinet, and AJOL. No impact factors have been established. There are mandatory 'front details' for papers and English abstracts. This is the journal's first independent peer review.

Suggested improvements:

Note: The journal was last published in 2014.

Consensus review: The difficulty of timely publication is viewed in a most serious light, and should be urgently addressed. There is an obvious danger here, i.e. that authors may look to publish their work elsewhere given current pressures on academics. It is suggested that non-problematic content is published on time, with an editorial note to explain any relatively 'thin' volumes. Otherwise the impression might be created that the journal invites controversy to the detriment of less controversial articles and in so doing muzzles its authors rather than giving them freedom of speech.

[Note: The Editor-in-Chief acknowledges that timely publication is a serious matter. The legal issues around the publication of Volume 34/35 have been resolved and the volume was subsequently published online and in printed format. The goal is to resume a regular publication schedule by the end of 2018.]

The Editors should seriously consider soliciting more international authors dealing with South African and African music in general. Authors from outside of the United Kingdom and the United States of America (or even outside of the English-speaking circle of scholarly experts) should be invited to publish.

It is recommended that additional scholarly features, such as book reviews and reports on scholarly meetings be included.

The journal should adhere to all accepted protocol regarding the reproduction of images and musical examples.

Panel's consensus view:

- I The journal should continue to be listed on the DHET list of accredited journals, provided that it returns to its regular publication schedule over a period of two years.
- II The journal should be invited to join the SciELO South Africa platform when it is back on its publishing schedule.
- III The Editors should seriously consider not delaying publication of non-problematic content and to get back on track with the journal's publishing schedule.
- IV In addition, the Panel believes that, despite its current problems, as outlined in a letter drafted by the Editors, the journal is to be commended for ranking among the most original of musicological journals, publishing articles almost completely devoted to musical contemporaneity.

4.1.6 *Vir die Musiekleier*

Focus and scope:

(Purpose of journal, positioning, focus, scope, readership)

Vir die Musiekleier is the flagship journal of SAKOV (*Suider-Afrikaanse Kerkorrelistevereniging* [Society for Church Organists of Southern Africa]).

It is the only accredited journal in South Africa that focuses on church music. The journal includes an interdisciplinary focus: Christian church music and history, church music and missiology, church music of various congregations, church music and international perspectives, spirituality and wellbeing.

It serves researchers, Christian church musicians, church organists, choir masters, educators, and ministers of religion from all cultural groups. The primary target audience are local and international scholars.

Editing functions:

(Standing, local institutional spread, international participation)

Consensus review: It should be noted that the (previous) Editor of this journal seemed to confuse the concept of an Editorial Board (normally comprising of a fairly consistent body of independent advisory associates) with a panel of peer reviewers which changes accordingly to the needs of each volume.

Additionally, it should be mentioned that the SAKOV Board fulfils the function of an Advisory Board to *Vir die Musiekleier*. The names of the SAKOV Board members, however, are not published in the journal. Thus it is unclear whether they occupy academic positions, and enjoy high, possibly international, standing within the field of hymnology or whether they are church music practitioners representing a specific denominational interest. It was suggested by more than one reviewer that publications submitted by a specific local tertiary music institution (North-West University (NWU)) are prioritised, which is cause for grave concern.

Questionnaire:

(Editorial process-related criteria)

Vir die Musiekleier is an annual publication that was established in 1980. It is not available online. The journal is pre-scheduled to appear on given dates. No significant events interrupted the publishing of this journal. It is distributed to 600 local leaders, 20 institutions and five international subscribers.

Over the three-year review period, 13 research articles and four reviews were published. The journal also published the following: ten CD reviews; one film soundtrack review; one original composition; and one arrangement for flute, organ and violin.

The journal publishes in different sections:

- Research-based articles of an academic nature on aspects regarding Christian church music and organ building in South Africa.
- Critical book, CD and audio reviews related to church, organ and choral music that stimulate dialogue.
- Original compositions.
- An essay competition for young researchers to motivate students to investigate suitable relevant topics and hereby promote research.
- Other topics which are of interest to the scholarly nature of the journal.

SAKOV reports were published until 2011 but from 2012 only the reports of the president of SAKOV were published. The editorial team decided to create another informal journal for reports and to focus on academic contributions in *Vir die Musiekleier*.

Over the review period, 20 manuscripts, two letters, two book reviews and three compositions were received. Seven manuscripts were rejected before peer review and three after peer review. One manuscript had an author with a foreign address.

[Note: Over the last two years (2016 to 2017), ten full articles and one CD review were published. Thirteen full articles were received over the same period. No submissions were rejected before peer review and two articles were rejected after peer review. Fifteen South African peer reviewers were used over 2017.]

Usually three, but in some cases four, peer reviewers are usually approached for each submitted manuscript. Peer reviewers are selected according to their expertise in the specific topic of the article, versatility, international status, local institutional representation and leadership in specific areas. Peer review is conducted 'blind'. The author receives a report from the Editor with the reviewers' comments. The author needs to respond to the comments and how they were handled in the final submission. The Editor contacted the peer reviewers for their final consent. Peer reviewers usually receive follow-up information. Reviewer performance is assessed and information is captured in a database. Twenty-five peer reviewers were used in one year and six of these reviewers were from outside the country. Peer-review reports were accessibly retained in the journal's records. The average period between receipt of a manuscript and its publication in print is 12 months (at the end of each year).

The previous Editor was involved with the journal since 2011. A new Editor took over the editorship from 2016. The board of SAKOV advertised the position and appointed the Editor. The period of appointment is indefinite. The Editorial Board members may act as peer reviewers and they provide guidance on editorial policies and practices. The EAB comprises a core of people from diverse subject fields and various institutions. They are appointed according to a selection process. The period of appointment is dealt with annually. If possible, at least two persons are appointed from outside the country.

The journal has editorial guidelines and these are aligned with ASSAf's *Code of Best Practice*. There is no conflict-of-interest policy. The journal will publish *errata* if necessary.

There are none of the usual value-adding features. Up to 80% of the pages in each issue represents peer-reviewed original material.

Content:

(Quality, focus, spread within domain, sample of best work in SA, enrichment features)

Consensus review: As the name of the journal implies, originally it was published only in Afrikaans, and for an Afrikaans Reformed readership, traces of which are still visible in the 2012 to 2014 volumes. Its focus is very narrow, and limiting, almost to the exclusion of non-Western Protestant Church Music, or that of other denominations. There is a high percentage of articles emanating from a single department in one institution.

In terms of quality assessment, it is noted that some of the 'value-adding' features included in this journal are not of the expected standard; for instance, some of the reviews read like magazine articles. Also, the quality of the published articles is highly variable. Relatively few represent new knowledge.

Essential technical features:

(English abstracts, errata, citation practice, presentation)

Abstracts in English are provided for all articles published in Afrikaans. No published *errata* could be found. Citation practice is adequate, including bibliographies. Presentation, layout and style are acceptable.

Usefulness in capacity development, and international comparability:

The journal is suitable as a general ongoing stimulus for local graduate students.

It is not easy to compare this journal with international journals. The perspective is too different because the mother body (SAKOV) has a unique kind of membership and the expectations of this membership will have to be taken into account. This is cause for concern if the journal is to earn greater national and international standing as an accredited publication.

Business aspects:

(Business-related criteria; Bibliometric assessments)

SAKOV owns and publishes the journal. The regular print run is 650 copies. Production and distribution are outsourced. Approximately four paid advertisements are included in the publication. SAKOV members pay an annual fee to SAKOV for publications, meetings, lectures and workshops. There are approximately 620 subscribers to the journal (20 organisations and 600 individuals). Page fees of R100 per page are charged.

Editorial workflow is managed via a manual system. It is not accessible online. No offers have been made to purchase the journal.

With regard to copyright, authors may not submit manuscripts which have been presented or published elsewhere. Authors must guarantee that the work submitted does not infringe on any existing copyright and indemnify the publisher against any breach of such warranties. All articles published in the journal are subject to the journal's copyright and may not be published or reproduced in any form without the Editor's prior consent. There is a licensing agreement with authors.

No bibliometric assessments have been made since this is not an online publication. 'Front details' for papers and English abstracts are mandatory. This is the journal's first independent peer review.

Suggested improvements:

It must be noted that this journal was reviewed by ASSAf in an *ad hoc* review in 2010. It was not recommended for DHET accreditation, only because of its restriction to a particular religious community, as it otherwise met the listed criteria and the policy requirements. It was recommended that the journal expand its scope to other religious fields. The recommendations from that review were not implemented.

Consensus review: There is no other journal in the country that covers this very important field of research and therefore the panel would like to see that this journal grows in importance. The intersection between music and religion is such a widespread activity in this country, yet so little research is being done on the topic. Therefore, it is important to support this work.

While the journal claims to serve 'researchers, Christian church ministers, church organists, choir masters, educators, and ministers of religion from all cultural groups', up to and including the 2014 volume, the journal strongly projects a practice-based Afrikaans Reformed focus.

This has mainly to do with the fact that *Vir die Musiekleier* is also the flagship of SAKOV, an association strongly anchored within the Afrikaans Reformed tradition. While steps have been taken to widen SAKOV's brief for the journal, the association thus far has not done so and the question should be posed whether this is a productive context for establishing *Vir die Musiekleier* as an accredited scholarly journal with an increased national and international interest and influence. The SAKOV Board should take a principled decision whether it wishes to retain the practice-based nature of the journal as mouthpiece of SAKOV or whether they wish to support the establishment of a sustainable accredited scholarly publication that answers to an independent editorial board, and truly serves a broader academic (and denominational) community. It cannot be both.

The Panel believes that SAKOV's continued control over the journal – a relationship acknowledged neither in the journal itself, nor in the questionnaire statements – should not prevent *Vir die Musiekleier* from overcoming its parochial and strongly denominational focus. As one reviewer put it, "...it needs either to extend its scope radically or nail its colours to the mast by stating upfront which South African church music community it is intended to serve". If the latter choice is made, the Panel believes that the journal should not retain its accredited status, and simply function as the mouthpiece for the denominational context in question.

It is recommended that a more rigorous vetting of the scholarly nature of published research articles should take place.

The scope of the journal should be broadened so that it can reflect the diversity of religious traditions in South Africa and in particular those that lie outside of the Reformed tradition.

An attempt should be made to enlist onto the Editorial Board one or more internationally-known scholars, preferable from different religious traditions.

A bolder approach should be taken to focus on newly-composed church music that is not merely so-called 'contemporary' church music. A much clearer indication on the masthead of the journal is needed of who it is intended to serve.

The retention of the Afrikaans Reformed (and indeed Afrikaans) character of the journal (including its title) should be reconsidered. Thus the practise-based, narrow, and exclusive focus of the journal should be addressed, as well as the (statistical) over-representation of NWU contributions.

The journal should publish 'new' knowledge and not recycle ideas and sources.

[Note: The Editor has resolved to address these issues at the next Executive Committee meeting of the SAKOV leadership.]

The Editor is aware of the lack of international expertise on the current board and will propose a new Editorial Board. The Editor also intends to extend the pool of reviewers to be much more inclusive, both in country of origin, field of expertise and denominational representation.

In addition, the Editor has set two goals: to establish a larger footprint for the journal both regionally and internationally, and to work towards launching the journal as an open source publication.]

Panel's consensus view:

- I The journal should continue to be listed on the DHET list of accredited journals, provided that, within a period of two years, the matter of SAKOV's narrow brief for the journal and its implied disciplinary limitations are productively addressed.
- II The journal should not be invited to join the SciELO South Africa platform; not until serious problems regarding the journal have been successfully addressed and the journal becomes an open access publication.

III The Editor should seriously consider appointing a proper Editorial Board comprising independent, expert advisory associates, while changing the panel of reviewers according to the needs of each volume (currently these critical functions are conflated). It is important that, in both instances, more international and a broader denominational representation should feature.

4.2 Performing Arts

4.2.1 *South African Theatre Journal (SATJ)*

Focus and scope:

(Purpose of journal, positioning, focus, scope, readership)

The *South African Theatre Journal (SATJ)* provides a leading forum for the academic discussion of issues relating to theatre, performance and the media, notably as these manifest themselves in southern Africa and further afield on the African continent. The journal features peer-reviewed articles on the history, theory and practice of the performing arts, as well as the methodology of theatre research and performance studies.

The *SATJ* is one of the only accredited academic journals that focuses on theatre and performance in South Africa. Acknowledging that research is intrinsically informed by the interplay of intertextual and interdisciplinary study, *SATJ* finds it imperative to encourage contributions from a diversity of authors irrespective of theoretical or methodological schools of thought. The journal also benefits from an international authorship and readership base.

SATJ is available to readers in both print and online, and through various subsidiaries including access via EBSCOhost and development initiatives such as INASP and Research4Life.

Editing functions:

(Standing, local institutional spread, international participation)

Consensus review: The journal has a high reputation, both nationally and internationally. The Editor-in-Chief is a nationally respected scholar, and has been with the journal since its inception, first as Technical Editor and more recently as Editor-in-Chief. The Editorial Board has good standing in the scholarly community. Members of the Editorial Board are chiefly well-established South African scholars from a variety of institutions, some with international reputations, or scholars working in other countries, including Kenya, Uganda and the United States. The Editor-in-Chief is NRF-rated and so are some of the other scholars who are in the South African university system. The Board demonstrates substantial expertise and spread to guarantee the competent appointment of the cornerstones of a journal's existence, namely competent peer reviewing.

Questionnaire:

(Editorial process-related criteria)

The *SATJ* was established in 1987. It is published in three issues per year. The journal is available online through Taylor & Francis (Routledge): <http://www.tandfonline.com/rthj>. In 2014, the *SATJ* received 5 972 full-text article downloads and 30 675 page views online. This journal is read in different regions across the world: Northern and Central Europe, Eastern Europe, North America, Latin America, Africa, Australasia, Asia Pacific, South Asia, and the Middle East. In 2014, the journal was read and downloaded by readers in 16 countries. The country with the most downloads was South Africa with 6 891. The list of other African countries is: Botswana, Cameroon, Eritrea, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda, Zimbabwe and Zambia. The journal is available to approximately 16 institutions and 346 libraries in South Africa and the rest of Africa.

Issues are pre-scheduled and appear regularly on given dates. A significant interruption was in 2013 due to a change in editorship. Over three volumes in the review period there were 43 full articles and 16 book reviews published. The number of manuscripts received were approximately 70 full articles, five review articles and 20 book reviews.

The rejection rate was 15% before the manuscripts were sent out for review. The number rejected after peer review was 31%. The proportion of peer-reviewed papers that had at least one author with a non-South African address was 13%.

A minimum of two peer reviewers are usually approached for each submitted manuscript. The *SATJ* has a reviewer database that has been built up over many years. The subject material of the articles gives the Editors an indication of who might be suitable as reviewers. At least one reviewer from abroad is chosen. Manuscripts go through a 'double-blind' peer-review process. The reviewers have the opportunity to see the articles again after revisions. The reviewers also receive the feedback of other reviewers of the article. Reviewer performance is assessed and information is captured on ScholarOne.

Twenty-three reviewers were used in a one year period (2014/2015). Four per cent of these reviewers were from outside South Africa. Peer-review reports were accessibly preserved in the journal's records. The average period between receipt of a manuscript and its publication in print is six months and online is four months.

The Editor-in-Chief has edited the journal for the last five years. The appointment was not competitive. The period of appointment was for five years. The Editorial Board handles peer review and advises on editorial policies and practices. The length of office for Editorial Board members is four years. The EAB membership changes every year with some members retiring and new members approached. The appointments are not competitive. The length of office is five years with the option to renew. Members are appointed from inside South Africa and abroad. Board members are chosen to give a broad coverage of the type of articles published by the journal. The Board provides topical expertise, and can often indicate who might be suitable as reviewers for articles.

The *SATJ* has detailed 'Instructions for Authors' online which gives information on the journal's editorial policy: <http://www.tandfonline.com/action/authorSubmission?journalCode=rthj20&page=instructions>. Taylor & Francis (Routledge) is a member of COPE. All of the Taylor & Francis (Routledge) journals, including the *SATJ*, abide by the COPE guidelines on publication ethics: <http://publicationethics.org/about>. The journal's guidelines are aligned with ASSAf's *Code of Best Practice*. It is the publisher's policy to publish *errata*, as per the guidelines.

Value-adding features such as critical editorials for special issues and analytical book reviews are published. There are other features such as play texts, festival and event reports. Generally 95% of the content represents peer reviewed material however this depends on whether the issues include editorials or not. The journal incorporates theatre reports, book reviews, commentaries, and play texts.

Content:

(Quality, focus, spread within domain, sample of best work in SA, enrichment features)

Consensus review: *SATJ* has consistently maintained a high level of quality, publishing articles by emerging, as well as established scholars. Research on practice, or practice-led research, lags behind historically-based research, although this journal does publish some practice pedagogy. At present the same people publish repeatedly in the journal. Local demands to publish internationally may also affect *SATJ*, though this has not resulted in a loss of quality. Moreover, among South African tertiary institutions there are few departments of theatre (and fewer still of performance studies), which inevitably limits the field for publication.

The journal's aims and scope statement acknowledges theatre, cinema, and other arts, from South Africa and elsewhere on the African continent; the publication emphasis remains, however, on South African theatre, locally performed. Over the three-year period examined, only 43 articles were published; yet the journal is published three times a year. There are some special topics or 'theme volumes' which may generate more discourse and topics for research.

The journal should consider its solitary place in the South African theatre context, and focus more on dramatic theory and drama criticism than review pieces. Book reviews now appear regularly. There are no other additional scholarly features. Play texts are not published, and could be included, particularly South African plays that are hard to find – bearing in mind the need to ensure appropriate copyright.

Essential technical features:

(English abstracts, errata, citation practice, presentation)

Consensus review: All articles are in English and are introduced by proper English-language abstracts. The citation practice is sound and proficient, in accordance with instructions to authors. Presentation, layout and design, style and copy-editing are good. As strong editorial practices are in place, *errata* occur infrequently but as needed. Its language editing can be commended as particularly professional.

The journal is urged to interrogate its research ethics processes and declarations. This is based on the premise that most (non-review type) articles originate from research projects at universities. A number of articles and photographs published by *SATJ* appear to endanger participants by opening them up to 'exposure' through publication. The Editors of the journal are urged to recognise this possibility and secure confidentiality and appropriate copyright. Where permission for publication has been granted, it should be acknowledged. If the outcomes of research projects are to be published in this journal, then research ethics considerations should be followed. The move to Taylor & Francis (Routledge) may help to clear up this concern.

Usefulness in capacity development, and international comparability:

Consensus review: The journal is useful as a high-standard 'first avenue' for gaining experience in publishing journal articles before trying to publish in titles that are indexed by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI). This journal 'sustains the discipline' with the publication of emerging scholars, articles by multiple authors, concerns of importance to post-graduate students and scholars, as well as thematic issues that assist readers in making connections between research areas.

It compares favourably with international journals. Even before the move to Taylor & Francis (Routledge), the journal was cited for good practice.

Business aspects:

(Business-related criteria; Bibliometric assessments)

Ownership vests in the *SATJ* and Taylor & Francis (Routledge) is the publisher of the journal. The regular print run is 75 in the UK and 50 in South Africa. Production and distribution is carried out by a printer based in the UK and NISC is responsible for distributing the copies from the South African printer. No advertising is carried in the journal and it is not financially sponsored. The journal is available to approximately 16 institutions and 346 libraries in South Africa and the rest of Africa. In addition, *SATJ* is also available to almost 2 198 institutions and libraries as part of Taylor & Francis (Routledge) sales deals. Page fees or article-processing fees are not charged. All article submissions are submitted via an electronic system, ScholarOne. The journal is held behind a pay wall and individuals and institutions need to take out subscriptions in order to be able to access the journal's content.

The publisher is multi-national with a South African office base and has not offered to purchase the journal. The *SATJ* retains ownership. It is a condition of publication that authors assign copyright or license the publication rights in their articles, including abstracts, to Taylor & Francis (Routledge). This enables Routledge to ensure full copyright protection and to disseminate the article, and the journal, to the widest possible readership in print and electronic formats. Authors retain many rights under the Routledge rights policies, which can be found at: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/copyright.asp>.

The journal is indexed in the Index to South African Periodicals (ISAP); the International Bibliography of Theatre and Dance (IBTD); Modern Language Association (MLA) Bibliography; and is a member of the Council of Editors of Learned Journals (CELJ). It does not have an impact factor. Altmetric indicators are available online. The number of full-text article downloads on the journal's website along with the number of citations the journal articles have received are recorded. There are mandatory 'front details' for papers and English abstracts for all articles. This is the journal's first independent peer review.

Suggested improvements:

Consensus review: The *SATJ* is the only accredited South African journal that focuses on theatre, and one of a handful of South African journals devoted to the performing arts (most of these journals are not accredited). It is commended for consistently maintaining a high level of quality.

The journal underwent an *ad hoc* review in 2014 and was then referred for accreditation; it seems that the reviewers' recommendations were implemented.

Lack of support for performance studies in South Africa, in publications and research funding, increases the potential for this journal to make a stronger impact, locally and internationally. Broadening the scope to discourse on performance could elicit interest from scholars and students in cognate disciplines. The journal could serve more generally as an advocate for this discussion in the arts in South Africa. Such an expansion in focus need not negatively affect the journal's historic and ongoing focus on South African theatre.

The *SATJ* might pay greater attention to visual information and design.

The rate of rejection is extremely high so the journal should make its mission, style and requirements clear to potential contributors.

The journal's authors include women but few black scholars, and although most volumes have international representation, South African scholars outnumber non-South Africans.

More international scholarship could be cultivated to increase its reputation and relevance worldwide, inviting contributions from the African continent and drawing on international scholarship in drama, theatre, film and performance studies.

A major concern is the tendency to publish 'reviews' of performances rather than robust research based in drama history, dramatic theory, performance theory or even dramatic criticism. It is generally considered easier to write review articles of performances rather than investigations of the discipline itself, practice-led writing or theoretical work. Reports of performances, festivals and artists are interesting to read, but do not significantly advance the discipline. Being more journalistic in content, they tend to lack methodology and theoretical vigour, and as such their usefulness for international scholarship is limited. A tendency towards review articles limits dissemination of more critical concerns.

The journal could also consider alliances with national conferences and festivals, such as the Shakespeare conference or the annual National Arts Festival, using these opportunities to create scholarly dialogue in the industry.

The Panel urges the journal to interrogate its research ethics processes and declarations. This is based on the premise that most (non-review type) articles originate from research projects at universities. Some leading journals will not publish in the absence of ethical clearance and confidentiality documentation embedded in the article itself. If the outcomes of research projects are to be published in this journal, then research ethics guidelines should be followed.

The Editors of the journal are urged to secure confidentiality and appropriate copyright.

Panel's consensus view:

- I The journal should continue to be listed on the DHET accredited list.
- II The journal cannot be invited to join SciELO South Africa since it has a publishing agreement with Taylor & Francis (Routledge). Inclusion would only be possible if the business relationship between the journal and Taylor & Francis (Routledge) were to change.
- III The Editor should invite more contributions from the African continent and draw on greater international scholarship on drama, theatre and film.
- IV The journal is encouraged to follow the recommendations in this review.

4.3 Visual Arts

4.3.1 *De Arte*

Focus and scope:

(Purpose of journal, positioning, focus, scope, readership)

de arte publishes articles on original research in the visual arts, art history, art criticism and related disciplines working with visual images. The journal aims to focus on the specific field of the visual arts which involves not only the disciplines of art history and art criticism but any related disciplines working with visual images. This emphasises its interdisciplinary approach.

The journal serves a small but vital discipline. It provides a platform for emerging and established scholars in South Africa to publish their research in the fields of the visual arts, art history, art criticism and related disciplines. It does not, however, stipulate a research focus on South Africa. The primary target audiences are local scholars although in the last few years the readership has widened to include international scholars. Its aim is to engage international interest by involving scholars from abroad in the refereeing process and inviting them to contribute book reviews.

The journal, which is now available online only, has a wide reach.

Editing functions:

(Standing, local institutional spread, international participation)

Consensus review: The Editor has been in this position for over 20 years and through this longstanding commitment in managing the quality of the publication, has built up a very strong reputation locally. While the journal's Advisory Board includes a diverse range of well-respected local and international scholars, its Editorial Board is predominantly white, and thus does not reflect South Africa's demographics or the journal's projected readership. Additionally, many articles published are written by members of the Editorial Board itself, which tends to compound the problem. It is recommended that the composition of the current Editorial Board be reconsidered in order to reflect a significant number of members of colour.

To achieve more diversity in terms of the Editorial Board and authors, some shifts in editorial approach and thinking could be put in place, even if these might be considered 'risky'. The journal tends to rely on a standard, set, almost formulaic 'scholarly' approach, which although academically sound and rigorous, does not allow for differences in writing styles, approaches, methodologies and content.

Questionnaire:

(Editorial process-related criteria)

de arte was established by the pre-eminent artist Walter Battiss in 1965. It is published biannually. The journal can be accessed on the Sabinet platform: http://reference.sabinet.co.za/sa_epublication/dearte and also through Taylor & Francis Online. From April 2014 to March 2015, there were 1 577 views and 1 411 downloads.

The journal was accessed by readers from approximately ten different countries; approximately five of these countries were African (including South Africa). It is pre-scheduled to appear regularly on given dates. There were no significant interruptions.

Over the period of review (2012 to 2014), 17 full articles, seven letters, 14 review articles, 28 book reviews, five 'other' papers and three obituaries were published. Twenty-three full article manuscripts were received. Six full article manuscripts were rejected without peer review and four were rejected after peer review. During the same period, 2.9% of peer-reviewed papers had at least one author with a non-South African address.

Two peer reviewers are approached to review each submitted manuscript. Peer reviewers are suggested and approved by the members of the Editorial Board. Peer review is conducted in a 'blind way'. All valid reviewer comments are implemented. Peer reviewers do not receive follow-up information.

Reviewer performance is assessed and such information is shared by the editorial team but not formally captured in a database. Fourteen reviewers were used in 2014. The proportion of these reviewers who had non-South African addresses is 36%. Peer-review reports were accessibly retained in the journal records, both electronically and in hard copy. The average period between receipt of a manuscript and its publication in print was approximately seven to eight months whilst for the online version the period was between six and seven months.

The Editor-in-Chief was appointed by the members of the Editorial Board and has been in the position since 1996. The period of appointment is indefinite. A Co-Editor was appointed in 2017. The Editorial Board occasionally handles peer review when the topic of the article falls within their fields of expertise. They also advise on editorial policies and practices. There is no set period of appointment but rotation happens when a member of the board resigns.

The EAB's term of office is five years. Members of the EAB are invited by the Editorial Board. Editorial Board members are selected from inside the country because they must be able to attend meetings. Advisory Board members include national but mostly international scholars who have a solid academic reputation. The Advisory Board provides specific topical expertise.

The editorial guidelines are available on the journal's website at <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rdat20/current>. There is no formal conflict-of-interest policy but processes and procedures are implemented with such interests in mind. Guidelines are not aligned with ASSAf's *Code of Best Practice*. When serious errors become apparent, then *errata* are published in the following edition.

The journal publishes value-adding features such as critical editorials, analytical book reviews and correspondence on published articles. Regular rubrics called 'Views & (Re) Views' and 'Collecting and Curating' were published in the past. However, both of these were removed to make space for more research articles.

Peer-reviewed original material varies depending on the number of articles published. Since the critical topical reviews sections were eliminated, around 77% of the total number of pages represents peer-reviewed original material.

Content:

(Quality, focus, spread within domain, sample of best work in SA, enrichment features)

Consensus review: The journal has a good reputation in South Africa and is well known as a scholarly journal. It plays an important role in sustaining and fostering local scholarship in the discipline of art history and in related fields such as art criticism and the visual arts.

The standard of the articles is generally good, but quality needs to take into consideration relevance and diversity of the research. The social relevance and content of articles could be broadened: the majority of authors are white and articles tend to be written from a limited range of perspectives and positionalities.

The journal does reflect a contextually adequate number of articles by authors from across the country, but the number of international authors and international readership could increase. Inclusion of book reviews provide important supporting material, but these could be expanded to include exhibition reviews, conference reports and scholarly correspondence.

Essential technical features:

(English abstracts, errata, citation practice, presentation)

Consensus review: The journal reflects use of proper, English-language abstracts for all articles. There is suitable publication of *errata*. Citation practice and copy-editing interventions are good. Images are used in an ethical manner. Its design and layout style are conventional.

Usefulness in capacity development, and international comparability:

Consensus review: The journal follows a primarily traditional (Westernised art historical) approach, which does not always speak to the needs and interests of young, emerging black researchers.

de arte is not comparable with the leading international journals in terms of content. While the content is locally relevant, little is done to situate that content within a broader international framework.

Business aspects:

(Business-related criteria; Bibliometric assessments)

Unisa owns the journal and it is published by Unisa Press in partnership with Taylor & Francis (Routledge). The regular print run was 180 copies per issue when it was printed but it is now only available online. Printing was outsourced but all the other services (language editing, typesetting, distribution, etc.) are provided by Unisa Press. No advertising is carried in the journal. The journal does not receive any financial sponsorship. This is a subscription-based journal. Approximately 90% of the readership of the print version is composed of individuals. The online version on Sabinet is subscribed to by organisations. There were 64 paying subscribers in 2015 (this includes higher education institutions, government departments, parastatals and private organisations). No page or article-processing fees are charged. The editorial workflow is managed using Editorial Manager. No offers have been made to purchase the journal.

Unisa Press is the copyright owner. Authors have to obtain permission for the publication of copyrighted material. Authors are requested to sign an agreement to transfer copyright to Unisa Press.

At this stage the journal is not indexed. However, there are third-party harvesters that harvest the meta-data to make the journal more discoverable like, Exlibris, EBSCOhost, Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) and Google Scholar. A submission was made to be listed with Scopus in 2015. An impact factor has not been determined. At the time of the review Sabinet did not make use of Altmetrics.

Mandatory 'front details' for papers and English abstracts are used. This is the first independent peer review of the journal.

Suggested improvements:

Consensus review: The journal has a good reputation and is a well-known scholarly journal.

The Editor has been in this position for 19 years. The journal should consider appointing a new editor to help inject new and fresh thinking around the journal's approach and content.

Many articles are authored by members of the Editorial Board. In this regard, the process of 'blind' reviews can be seen as suspect.

The Editor should consider international leadership, authorship and readership to increase international presence and relevance. This can be accomplished not only through book reviews and referee reports but by article and edition subjects and approaches of international significance.

The number of international authors and international readership could increase.

The inclusion of book reviews could be expanded to include exhibition reviews, conference reports and scholarly correspondence to further enrich the journal.

Themed issues and guest-edited special issues should be considered, particularly in light of encouraging a diverse number of approaches and a broader range of perspectives.

Panel's consensus view:

- I The journal should continue to be listed on the DHET accredited list.
- II The journal should be invited to join the SciELO South Africa platform provided that it becomes open access.

- III The composition of the Editorial Board needs urgent reconsideration, paying attention to diversity.
- IV The journal should consider diversifying authors, subject areas, approaches, and methodologies.
- V The Panel believes that the journal plays an important role in South African scholarship in the fields of art history, art criticism, art theory and other visually-related fields.

4.3.2 *Image and Text*

Focus and scope:

(Purpose of journal, positioning, focus, scope, readership)

Image & Text has been positioned as a multi and interdisciplinary journal for visual culture, as opposed to journals that might focus on cultural studies or fine arts or art history. The aim of the journal is to draw perspectives from a broad field of interests and subjects: visual anthropology, material culture, visual arts, design culture, visualising sciences and technologies, art history, philosophy, fashion, media and film studies, architecture, literary studies, tourism studies, new media and cyber theory.

Image & Text publishes original research in the domain of visual culture and many of the articles deal with topics or issues that are not covered in other platforms, and the majority of articles have a South African resonance. The emphasis of the journal is on the global south and also on encouraging emerging scholars and emerging fields. Visual culture is a dynamic field and *Image & Text* addresses this both in its content and design format. As stated above, the primary emphasis has been on developing scholarship in the global south, but submissions have come from Europe, the USA, as well as from the rest of southern Africa.

The readership, comprising theorists (and practitioners) in visual culture, visual arts and art history, design studies, architecture, communication, film, literature, etc., is also not situated exclusively in South Africa. *Image & Text* is read nationally, with many institutional and organisational subscribers, and there are also international subscribers. Many institutions use the articles as reference material for their students and as a source of primary research about South African visual culture discourses.

Editing functions:

(Standing, local institutional spread, international participation)

Consensus review: The (previous) Editor-in-Chief is a highly regarded South African academic, who has a strong standing in the field of South African visual culture. She is supported by a competent editorial team. This team reflects a balance between South African and international academics, and is balanced in terms of diversity.

While some members are locally and internationally acclaimed visual culture theorists, the Advisory Board appears to be composed entirely of white academics. This is undesirable for a South African journal that deals extensively with local content. Advisory Board members are also primarily from South Africa, the USA and the UK.

Questionnaire:

(Editorial process-related criteria)

The journal was established in 1992. It has been published biannually since 2011. It is accessible online at <http://www.imageandtext.up.ac.za/> and via Sabinet at http://reference.sabinet.co.za/sa_epublication/imtext. On average, there are 2 000 visits per issue. Sabinet statistics show that from January 2012 to December 2014 there were 4 187 views and 1 346 downloads. There were views and downloads from nine countries in total and five African countries (Sabinet).

There are no scheduled dates for publication, but it generally appears in January/February and July/August each year. There have been no significant interruptions in publication since the journal was established.

Over a three-year period (2013 to 2015), 43 full articles, one review article, six book reviews, two conference reports, one exhibition review and six editorials were published.

A total of 67 full article manuscripts were received. Eleven full research articles (16%) were rejected without peer review and 13 (19%) were rejected after peer review. The proportion of full research articles that had at least one author with a non-South African address was 19%.

A minimum of two reviewers is used for each article. However, quite frequently three or four are used if opinion is divided. Peer reviewers are selected for their expertise in a given field and their track record of submitting useful reports. They should have no conflict of interest regarding the paper. Peer review is conducted 'blind'. The implementation of reviewers' comments and criticism is implemented stringently. The Editor or Guest Editor must insist that authors address and respond to valid and relevant reviewers' comments. In some cases, articles are sent back to authors a second time if the Editor/Guest Editor is not satisfied that the comments have been dealt with satisfactorily. In problematic cases, revised articles are sent back to the original reviewer/s for final screening and may still be rejected at that stage. Some papers undergo a preliminary round of conceptual and technical feedback before they are sent for peer review, usually when a Guest Editor is used for a themed section or issue.

Peer reviewers do not necessarily receive follow-up information, but if requested the information is provided. Reviewer performance is assessed and unhelpful reviewers or those who deliver unsatisfactory reports are not approached again. The journal attempts not to use the same reviewers too frequently. An Excel database is used to manage the data. A total of 29 reviewers were used in 2012 (numbers 21 and 22). Of these reviewers, 10% were not local. Peer-review reports are accessibly retained. Many reviewers also make extensive comments on the texts themselves via track changes, and these versions of the articles are also kept. The average period between receipt of a manuscript and its publication online is six to nine months.

The Editor was selected by the outgoing Editor and colleagues in the Department of Visual Arts at the University of Pretoria (UP) and has held the position since 2011. Since the journal is linked to this department, it is preferable to have an editor who is *in situ*. There is no set term of appointment but the Editor has to formulate a succession plan so that the journal can be passed on to a new editor in a few years' time. Two new Co-Editors have since taken over the editorship of the journal.

The Editorial Board members conduct peer review but only if the topic is in their fields of expertise. They advise on editorial policies and practices. The current Editorial Board has been active since 2011, but a few members resigned and new members were appointed in 2015. The EAB has also been active since 2011. Members are nominated and appointed based on their expertise in the relevant disciplines, experience in research and publishing, or standing in the field. EAB members generally hold their positions for three to five years. The Editorial Board members are from inside the country and the Advisory Board consists of national and international experts. It is convenient for the Editorial Board to be local because a number of the members who serve in an operational capacity, as well as provide guidance on matters of policy, content, etc. The EAB provide specific topical expertise.

The editorial guidelines are published in the journal and are available on the university's website. No formal conflict-of-interest policy has been formulated but this is taken into consideration when appointing peer reviewers. Authors sign a form that declares that they do not have any conflict of interest. As far as possible guidelines are aligned with ASSAf's *Code of Best Practice*. The journal would publish *errata* if the Editors are notified of any errors.

The journal publishes the following value-adding features: critical editorials, critical topical reviews, analytical book reviews, conference reports, and exhibition reviews.

Image and Text publishes between 90% and 97% peer-reviewed original material.

Content:

(Quality, focus, spread within domain, sample of best work in SA, enrichment features)

Consensus review: The quality of the articles published is generally high. The journal reflects a contextually adequate number of articles by authors from across the country, but the number of international authors could increase.

Most of the work represented in the journal (both artistic and analytical) is innovative and most interesting, aptly contributing to the field of visual culture and communication in South Africa, even as it also provides an effective platform for representing South African research internationally.

Inclusion of book and exhibition reviews, and conference reports provide important supporting material.

Essential technical features:

(English abstracts, errata, citation practice, presentation)

Consensus review: The journal reflects use of proper, English-language abstracts for all articles. No *errata* appeared in the issues under review. The citation practice is good and the Harvard method is used consistently throughout. Its design and layout style is fresh, contemporary, accessible, and visually attractive.

Usefulness in capacity development, and international comparability

Consensus review: Many of the articles deal with relevant, topical subject matter that is well-suited to the needs of young graduate students and developing researchers.

Image and Text compares favourably with leading international journals. The journal should consider establishing contact with other international journals like *InVisible Culture: An Electronic Journal for Visual Culture* and *Visual Culture and Gender* with the idea of cross-pollinating the international and South African visual culture discourse, especially for postgraduate students.

Business aspects:

(Business-related criteria; Bibliometric assessments)

The Department of Visual Arts, at UP, owns and publishes the journal. The journal has been available online since 2008. It does not carry advertising. It receives no financial sponsorship. According to Sabinet, there are 63 national and international subscribers. This relatively low number does not indicate the number of views and downloads that take place via Sabinet or the number of people who access the journal via the online open access platform at UP. All subscribers seem to be institutions or organisations.

There are no page or article-processing charges but this is being considered. The journal uses a manual system to manage its editorial workflow. It is freely accessible online (open access) via the Sabinet African Journal Archive. No offers to purchase have been made. With regards to copyright, authors retain copyright of their material. There is no licensing agreement with authors.

No bibliometric assessments have been made other than the information available through Sabinet. The journal is not indexed and has no impact factor. 'Front details' for papers and English abstracts are published on the first page of the article or on the table of contents, with an email address, as well as at least six keywords.

The journal has not been independently peer reviewed before.

Suggested improvements:

Consensus review: The journal is of consistently high calibre and meets national and international standards. It provides an effective platform for disseminating research on South African visual culture.

It is recommended that the composition of the current Advisory Board be reconsidered, and that there be an evaluation of each member, in terms of their capacity to contribute meaningful input. The panel strongly recommends that a significant number of Advisory Board members of colour be recruited. In addition, a number of theorists from the global South should be included, particularly academics from the African continent.

[Note: The new Co-Editors have already begun to address this issue and a new Editorial Board has been put in place with four members of colour being recruited.]

The journal could attract a broader international readership and range of international authors, as well as local ones. In this regard, it is recommended that the journal apply for Scopus or ISI accreditation.

The journal should exploit its digital format more, e.g. by inserting hyperlinks from the Table of Contents for easier reading and searching.

Panel's consensus view:

- I The journal should continue to be listed on the DHET accredited list.
- II The journal should be invited to join the SciELO South Africa platform.
- III The composition of the Advisory Board needs urgent reconsideration, paying attention to diversity and the appointment of members from the continent and the global South.
- IV The Panel believes that the journal has played an invaluable role in documenting design and visual culture discourse in South Africa over the last two decades.

4.3.3 South African Journal of Art History

Focus and scope:

(Purpose of journal, positioning, focus, scope, readership)

The focus of the *South African Journal of Art History (SAJAH)* is on the visual arts and aesthetics. It has an interdisciplinary focus on all visual arts: art and architectural history; art and architectural theory aesthetics and philosophy of art; visual culture; film and photography; history of craft; and history of design. *SAJAH* has been accredited since 1984.

The target audiences are from academic departments of Art History, Architecture and Philosophy (Aesthetics) in South Africa and many overseas countries.

The printed journal is distributed widely in South Africa and overseas. It is also available on its website, through Sabinet and UP Space. *SAJAH* has 50 international subscribers such as the British Library, Princeton University and Stanford University.

Editing functions:

(Standing, local institutional spread, international participation)

Consensus review: With some exceptions, the Editorial Board members do not have high national disciplinary reputations. Some members have published internationally. The Editor-in-Chief has been in the position since 2005. The Editorial Board represents a variety of arts disciplines, including a number of researchers in architecture, but is not yet representative of the wider South African community.

The Editorial Board members and Editor publish regularly in the journal. According to codes of conduct for journal editors, papers written by the Editor-in-Chief should be peer reviewed independently and the process should be detailed in the journal.

The journal has an International Advisory Board with scholars from disciplines of art history and architecture from a good range of different countries. The Advisory Board includes some very prominent international scholars.

Questionnaire:

(Editorial process-related criteria)

SAJAH was established in 1984. Two to four issues are published per annum. The journal is not solely online; printed issues are also distributed. It is not pre-scheduled to appear on certain dates. Rather, issues are published when they are completed during the year. There have been no significant interruptions over the years of its publication.

During the three-year review period, 118 full articles and three book reviews were published. The number of full article manuscripts received totalled 128. Five per cent of the manuscripts were rejected without peer review. Of the total manuscripts received, approximately eight per cent were rejected after peer review. Seven per cent of peer-reviewed papers had at least one author with a non-South African address.

Two peer reviewers are usually approached to review each submitted manuscript but if there is no consensus then three are approached. Peer reviewers are selected from experts in the field of the submitted article. Peer reviewers are also selected from committee members, volunteers and a panel of international advisors that represent various fields of interest. Peer review is conducted in a 'blind way'. Authors have to report back to the Editor about changes implemented after critique. If the Editor is satisfied that the article has been improved, it is accepted. The resubmitted articles are often sent back to original reviewers, or the Editor can request a third reviewer to give an opinion about the suitability of a problematic case in which an author rejects criticism. A total of 60 peer reviewers were used in one year in the review period. The proportion of these who had non-South African addresses was 15%. Peer-review reports were accessibly retained in the journal's records. The average period between receipt of a manuscript and its publication in print is six to seven months and online is three to four months.

The Editor-in-Chief was invited to edit the journal and has held the position since 2003. The period of appointment is indefinite. The Editorial Board handles peer review and advises on editorial policies and practices. The term of office for Editorial Board members is between five and seven years. Members were not appointed competitively. The period of employment is indefinite. The EAB members serve between three and ten years. Members are from inside the country and represent most universities with departments of visual arts, aesthetics and/or architecture. International Advisors are all from outside the country and are invited to join the Advisory Board after at least one publication in *SAJAH*. Advisory Board members provide specific topical expertise, act as guest editors and referee articles in their fields of expertise.

SAJAH has 'Instructions to Authors' providing guidelines for submissions. There is no conflict-of-interest policy. Guidelines are not necessarily aligned with ASSAf's *Code of Best Practice*. *Errata* could be published, but it has never been requested by authors.

Editorials are only written in the case of special themed issues. Book reviews are only included when members of the Art Historical Work Group (AHWG) publish a book. There are no other value-added features.

Generally 100% of the pages in each issue represents peer-reviewed original material.

Content:

(Quality, focus, spread within domain, sample of best work in SA, enrichment features)

Consensus review: *SAJAH* is the only journal that consistently and systematically publishes research in architecture in South Africa. The architectural essays appear to be of a good quality, but there is some concern about the quality of essays dealing with the visual and fine arts. There are a good number of articles per annum. This journal is limited in terms of the pool of authors whose work it publishes.

The visual and fine arts articles often do not compare favourably to what is published in the fields of visual studies or art history in South Africa. Articles by authors from across the country are published, but only from members of the AHWG. There were only a few international contributions in the volumes under review. The journal does focus on local or regional kinds of problems, but also addresses aesthetic and historical topics of international interest.

Essential technical features:

(English abstracts, errata, citation practice, presentation)

Consensus review: Abstracts are in two and sometimes three languages. However, they do not always present a clear summary of the key arguments in the articles. The journal has, in the main, followed good citation practice. Acknowledgment and crediting of published images should be improved. There are some indications of what might be construed as plagiarism. A number of grammatical and spelling errors were observed, also in the Afrikaans abstracts. No *errata* were found in the volumes under review. The visual design and the layout of the journal is rather unattractive. More attention can be paid to detail, especially in copy editing.

Usefulness in capacity development, and international comparability:

Consensus review: During the review period a few articles by graduate students and young researchers were published. The journal plays a limited role in producing new knowledge and generating public discourse. More could be done to make it an ongoing stimulus for local graduate students or young staff in the arts disciplines.

There are very few international contributions in *SAJAH*. It cannot as yet be compared with international journals.

Business aspects:

(Business-related criteria; Bibliometric assessments)

SAJAH is independent and sponsored by members of the AHWG of South Africa. All contributors are requested to become members of the AHWG. The regular print run is 80 copies. The Editor and Committee members do the distribution. The journal does not carry advertising. Authors are charged page fees to publish in the journal. There are 80 paying subscribers and all the South African academic libraries subscribe. An Online Management System is used to manage the editorial workflow. Access to *SAJAH* online is password protected but a password can be requested. The journal has not had offers to purchase.

Copyright belongs to the authors who publish in *SAJAH* but there is no licensing agreement with authors. There are no other policies in place.

Limited bibliometrics (number of views, downloads and citations) are available on Sabinet. The journal has not been indexed although it can be accessed via Google Scholar. There are 'front details' for papers in the form of keywords and author biographies. Abstracts are published bilingually in the languages of the author's choice.

The journal has not been independently peer reviewed before.

Suggested improvements:

Consensus review: The Editor is to be commended for her efforts to inspire and improve the journal over a long period of time. A new Editor has recently taken over the editorship.

The journal still seems limited by its historical association with historically Afrikaans institutions, though many writers now come from universities of technology. The Editor might consider publishing fewer articles of a higher general quality as measured by wider engagement with recent international and African trends and theoretical approaches and a more extensive and more recent reference base. The journal seems to operate within a limited intellectual horizon, as indicated by a relatively small number of references and a relative lack of references to very recent research in the articles. This horizon should be expanded by engaging with more cutting-edge work in the arts in South Africa, Africa and abroad. Linking up with other art history departments and members of South African Visual Art Historians (SAVAH) might be fruitful in this regard.

The journal should be completely revised and its network extended in order to increase its relevance in the arts disciplines. A new competitively selected editorial team, more balanced in terms of institutional representation and race, should be recruited. Academics who have international and African connections in the field, could be approached to play an editorial role in the journal. The journal should update its reach by advertising and publicising itself to the dominant scholars in the field.

One reviewer suggested that the journal tighten its focus on architecture. Smaller, regular editions dedicated to the discipline of architecture might be a means to increase the quality and reputation of the journal. The panel recommends that the journal include 'Architecture' in its title to further emphasise its focus.

The *SAJAH* website is not attractive and does not function well and therefore should be redesigned. It should include guidelines for authors as well as the names of the Editorial Board members and the International Advisory Board. Recent issues of the journal are available on the Sabinet platform (up to 2016), but the Sabinet interface is not very suitable for marketing the journal.

A cutting-edge local journal would entice good local scholars to also publish locally. Submissions should be opened up to all writers; membership of the AHWG should not be a pre-requisite. The editorial process for submitted work should be clarified.

The journal should pay much more attention to copy editing.

Panel's consensus view:

- I The journal should continue to be listed on the DHET list of accredited journals, provided that a thorough rethinking and redesign of the journal are effected within three years.
- II The journal should not be invited to join the SciELO South Africa platform until evidence can be presented that it has addressed the recommendations made in this report.
- III The Editorial Board is not yet representative of the wider South African community and therefore should be broadened.
- IV The journal should move away from the impression that it is elitist and regional by expanding its intellectual horizon, authorship and readership.

Appendix A:

Questionnaire Sent to Each Editor of Journals being Peer Reviewed

The questionnaire was revised in 2015 before the reviews took place.

1. Purpose of journal, positioning, focus, scope, readership, etc.

- 1.1 What is the focus and scope of the journal (i.e. what does it say about this in your mast-head)?
- 1.2 Is the journal's aim to focus on a specific discipline or field or does it (also) include an interdisciplinary focus?
- 1.3 How does the journal serve the South African research community in relation to its focus and scope?
- 1.4 Who are your primary target audiences (predominantly local scholars or also further afield)?
- 1.5 What is the journal's reach and how is the readership composed? (i.e. international subscribers, institutions, and/or individuals in terms of numbers and/or percentages)?

2. Editorial process-related criteria:

- 2.1 When was the journal established?
- 2.2 What is the publication frequency of your journal, per year?
- 2.3 If online,
 - 2.3.1 What is its URL?
 - 2.3.2 What is the visit and downloaded record?
 - 2.3.3 In how many countries is the journal read?
 - 2.3.4 In how many African countries is the journal read?
- 2.4 Scheduled issues:
 - 2.4.1 Are issues of your journals pre-scheduled to appear on given dates?
 - 2.4.2 If scheduled, do the issues in fact appear regularly on the scheduled dates?
- 2.5 Have there been significant interruptions in publication since the journal's inception? If so, provide details.
- 2.6 Peer-reviewed original papers:
 - 2.6.1 How many peer-reviewed original papers have you published during the last three years:
 - a. Full articles?
 - b. Letters?
 - c. Review articles?
 - d. Book reviews?
 - e. 'Conference papers'?
 - f. Other?

- 2.6.2 How many manuscripts in each of the above categories were received in the last three years?
- 2.7 Rejection rate:
- 2.7.1 Approximately how many manuscripts in each category were rejected without peer review (as a pre-peer-review decision)?
- 2.7.2 How many were rejected after peer-review?
- 2.8 What proportion of peer-reviewed papers of all kinds that you published had at least one author with a non-South African address?
- 2.9 Peer reviewers:
- 2.9.1 How many peer reviewers are usually approached for EACH submitted manuscript?
- 2.9.2 How are peer reviewers selected?
- 2.10 Is peer review conducted in a 'blind way', i.e. authors and institutions blinded out?
- 2.11 How rigorous is the implementation of valid reviewer critique and article improvement?
- 2.12 Do peer reviewers receive follow-up information, e.g. outcomes of the reviews?
- 2.13 Is reviewer performance assessed and is such information captured in a database?
- 2.14 Total of peer reviewers
- 2.14.1 How many peer reviewers were used in total, in any ONE of the last three years?
- 2.14.2 What proportion of these had non-South African addresses?
- 2.15 Are peer-review reports accessibly retained in your records?
- 2.16 What is the average period between receipt of a manuscript and its publication
- In print?
 - Online?
- 2.17 Editor/Editor-in-Chief
- 2.17.1 How long have you been Editor/Chief Editor of this journal?
- 2.17.2 Were you appointed competitively (i.e. following advertisement and a selection process)?
- 2.17.3 For what period have you been appointed?
- 2.18 Do members of your Editorial Board and/or Editorial Advisory Board:
- 2.18.1 Handle peer review of individual manuscripts?
- 2.18.2 Advise on editorial policies/practices?
- 2.18.3 How long have they been in office?
- Editorial Board:
- Editorial Advisory Board:
- 2.18.4 Are they appointed competitively (i.e. following advertisement and a selection process)?
- 2.18.5 For what period?
- 2.18.6 From inside and outside the country?
- 2.18.7 To provide specific topical expertise?

2.19 Policies

- 2.19.1 Do you have published editorial/policy guidelines? What is the policy? (Please send us a copy)
- 2.19.2 Is there a conflict-of-interest policy? If so, please provide details.
- 2.19.3 Have your editorial/policy guidelines been aligned with the ASSAf *National Code of Best Practice in Editorial Discretion and Peer Review*?

2.20 Do you publish *errata* in all cases where errors have become apparent? What is your policy?

2.21 Does your journal contain value-adding features such as:

- Critical Editorials?
- 'News and Views' analyses of articles being published?
- Critical topical reviews?
- Analytical book reviews?
- Correspondence on published articles?
- Others?

2.22 What is the percentage of pages in each issue that represents peer-reviewed original material?

3. Business-related criteria:

3.1 Who is the actual title owner (legally) of the journal? And the publisher?

3.2 What is the regular print run of your journal, if it is printed?

3.3 Is production and distribution outsourced? If so, provide details.

3.4 Do you carry advertising which is:

- Paid?
- Unpaid?

3.5 Do you receive financial sponsorship(s)? If so, please list the sponsors and provide details.

3.6 What is the number of paying subscribers?

3.7 How many of the subscribers are organisations as opposed to individuals?

3.8 Do you impose page charges or article-processing charges on authors? If so, provide details.

3.9 How is the editorial workflow of the journal managed?

- Online Management System
- Loading of articles onto web
- Manual systems
- Other

3.10 If your journal appears online:

- Is it free online (open access)?
- Is it free online but password protected?
- Is it part of a commercial (pay-to-view and/or pay-to-subscribe) e-publication service?
- Is it part of a non-commercial e-publication mechanism (i.e. Medline)?

- 3.11 What is the journal's estimated total cost per annum?
- 3.12 Has the journal had offers to purchase from multi-national publishers?
- 3.13 What are your copyright arrangements?
- 3.14 What licensing agreement do you have with authors?

4. **Bibliometric assessments:**

- 4.1 Could you provide us with a list of the indexes in which the journal is indexed (including Web of Science and/or the IBSS, Google Scholar, Scopus as well as others)?
- 4.2 Have impact factors (e.g. Google Scholar, WoS or Scopus) ever been determined for your journal? If so, what were they?
- 4.3 Do you use any altmetric indicators (number of visits to journal website, number of downloads, citations on social media) to monitor the journal's 'performance'?
- 4.4 Are 'front details' for papers like titles, authors, addresses, affiliations and English abstracts mandatory?
- 4.5 Has your journal ever been independently peer reviewed before and by whom?

5. **General:**

- 5.1 Is there any other information or do you have any comments that may be useful to the Panel?
- 5.2 What do you regard as the main challenges that the Journal and the Editorial team face?

Appendix B:

Requests to Independent Peer Reviewers

1. Do the hard copies of the last 2 – 3 years of issues of the journal reflect:

- 1.1 high national/international disciplinary reputations/standing of the Editor-in-Chief/ Associate Editors/members of the Editorial Board?
- 1.2 a high/good (general/average) quality of the articles accepted/published?
- 1.3 a (contextually) adequate/good number of articles per annum?
- 1.4 an (adequate/good) sample of the best work done in the country in the discipline/field?
- 1.5 a focus on local/regional kinds of materials/problems?
- 1.6 publication of articles by authors from across the country, and internationally?
- 1.7 useful additional scholarly features like editorials, topical reviews, book reviews, scholarly correspondence, etc.?
- 1.8 proper (English-language) abstracts for all articles?
- 1.9 suitable publication of *errata*?
- 1.10 good citation practice?
- 1.11 good presentation, design, layout, style, copy-editing interventions, images are used in an ethical manner?
- 1.12 suitability as a general ongoing stimulus for local graduate students/young staff in the discipline concerned?
- 1.13 some kind of comparability with leading international journals in the field?

2. Please list your suggestions for an improvement programme for the journal.

