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setting. The findings from the earlier salvage archaeology at the Stillwater Marsh were presented by Tuohy et al. (1987). This paper includes important data on 33 human burials and additional skeletal remains, some from the sites investigated in this report. Further analysis of the skeletal remains from these sites is presented by Brooks et al. (1990).
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These three volumes are a series that purportedly report the papers presented at the annual meetings of the Society for California Archaeology. Volume 1 contains papers presented at the 1987 annual meeting at Fresno, Volume 2 contains papers presented at the 1988 annual meeting at Redding, and Volume 3 contains papers presented at the 1989 annual meeting at Los Angeles. The goal of the Proceedings series as stated in Volume 1 (p. iii) is “... to act as a needed outlet for the timely publication and distribution of research in California archaeology.” “The SCA Proceedings is meant ... to include any well-written scholarly paper presented at an SCA Annual Meeting” (p. 411).

The SCA Proceedings series was initiated during the presidency of Susan M. Hector. The proposal for a publication series was presented in the SCA Newsletter and an oppor-
tunity for the membership to comment was provided. There was little response from the SCA membership (Jim Woodward, personal communication 1991). The Board of Directors assumed leadership and, as a result, the SCA By-laws now include the mandate to publish an annual Proceedings. Although the editorial policies are at the discretion of the Editorial Board, they must be approved by the Board of Directors of the SCA.

Any proceedings series, ideally, should report the significant activities that took place during the course of a meeting so that a permanent record of significant presentations and events is available to those unable to attend the meeting or specific sessions. This series should also act as a medium for dissemination of up-to-date information to professional and avocational archaeologists. The Proceedings concept is commendable, but three observations are in order. First, one would hopefully anticipate that each Proceedings would be an accurate reflection of the significant things said or done during the meetings or, minimally, a representative sample of the papers and topics that were presented. Unfortunately this is not the case in any of the three volumes. Second, some of the papers obviously would benefit greatly by peer review and editorial changes. Third, the above stated goal of the Proceedings may need revision.

Papers presented at the annual meetings are now voluntarily submitted for publication in the Proceedings. This, in effect, results in a publication that is not an accurate reflection of the presentations at the meetings. At the 1987 annual meeting, 126 papers (not including introductory remarks) were presented in 16 topical sessions; 25 of the papers (about 20%) were published in Volume 1 of the Proceedings. Numerically, 20% might have constituted a representative sample of the information presented, but a more definitive look indicates that no papers from 10 of the 16 sessions (63%) were published in Volume 1. Other sessions were over-represented; six of the nine papers presented in both sessions Five (Archaeology and Ethnography of the Central and Southern Sierra) and Seven (Late Prehistoric Archaeology of the San Diego Region) were published, and eight of the nine papers in Session Six (Middle Period Archaeology of San Francisco Bay) were published.

The same problems continue in volumes 2 and 3. At the 1988 annual meeting, 127 papers (excluding two videos and introductory comments) were presented in 18 sessions. Eleven of the 18 sessions (61%) were not represented among the 14 published papers in Volume 2, and only 10.9% of the total of the presented papers was published. Three of five papers presented in Session Nine (Southern California Research) were published. Session Six (North Coastal California Research Directions) was represented by three of eight presented papers. Five other sessions had minimal representation.

At the 1989 annual meeting 103 papers were presented in 18 sessions. Twenty-one papers (20%) were published in Volume 3 of the Proceedings (with the addition of the keynote address by Brian Fagan). Again, this was not a representative sample. No papers were published from eight of the 18 sessions (44%). Only one paper was published from each of six other sessions. All five papers from Session 2 (Santa Ynez River Basin) were published. Three of the six papers presented in Session 15 (Rock Art), two of four papers in Session 6 (Santa Barbara Area), and four of the seven papers in Session 13 (Edwards Air Force Base) were published. One paper was published that was not presented at the meetings. The SCA Board of Directors and the Editorial Board should consider some method of arriving at a more representative
sample of the significant archaeological research reported.

Peer review and editorial revisions would enhance the scholarly content and editorial quality of the Proceedings. A number of published papers were suspiciously similar in format to cultural resource management reports submitted to federal and state agencies. A few overviews of already available information did not present new knowledge, methods, or theory. Misinformation is blatantly obvious in at least one paper (Christenson 1990). Spelling and grammatical errors are common. Review by knowledgeable persons and suggestions for editorial changes would certainly avoid these pitfalls.

These criticisms of the Proceedings concept and editorial policies are not meant to be universally applied. Many of the published papers in volumes 1, 2, and 3 are important, well-edited, and present new information and/or ideas. The Proceedings would be exemplary had their level of quality been maintained throughout each of the volumes and if other important papers had been solicited by the editors.

The Editorial Board annually expends considerable effort in extracting manuscripts from presenters at the annual meetings. Editorial duties are burdensome and thankless. Membership support in terms of submitted manuscripts and in terms of the purchase of the Proceedings has been less than overwhelming. Is the effort and expense worthwhile?

The SCA needs to rethink and revise the goals and/or the name of this publication. Is the goal to provide a vehicle for scientific communication within the SCA and larger scientific community or is the goal to provide a publication outlet for any papers that have not been published elsewhere? If the SCA goal is communication of annual meeting activities to the membership and the scientific community, then the Editorial Board needs further direction from the SCA Board of Directors regarding ways to attain that goal.

Does the Proceedings fill a real gap in opportunities to publish significant materials in a timely fashion or is it an easy way to get a publication credit on a résumé? A number of papers and symposia that were presented at annual meetings have been published elsewhere as journal articles, cultural resource management reports, etc. If the goal of the Proceedings is simply to provide an alternative publication outlet, then the Editorial Board needs direction from the Board of Directors in order to exercise better scholarly and editorial quality control and insure that the expenditure of SCA funds on the Proceedings is worthwhile. The clarification of goals and the setting of policy are the responsibilities of the Board of Directors, but it is the interest and support of the membership that is the key to the ultimate success or failure of the Proceedings series.
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