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Saluting Our Reviewers

The original Communications in Information Literacy (CIL) review board was convened in 2006, about a year before the publication of the journal’s inaugural issue. Co-founder Stewart Brower and I believed it was necessary at the time to assemble a proverbial “dream team” of board members that would include recognized leaders from the information literacy community, thereby buttressing the journal’s foundations with an appealing measure of reputability. Accordingly, we solicited preeminent information literacy scholars and practitioners, and we recruited heavily from multiple generations of the ACRL Instruction Section’s Research and Scholarship Committee. We also believed it was critical to the future success of CIL, and to the advancement of the literature in general, to include a counterbalance of new voices and fresh perspectives on the board, and we explored a variety of channels to identify and petition librarians from outside the established centers of information literacy discourse. Such was the provenance of CIL’s review board.

Stewart and I officially launched CIL during a presentation at the 36th Annual Workshop on Instruction in Library Use (WILU) in 2007. The staging of this new, open access journal dedicated entirely to information literacy in higher education generated an unanticipated wave of enthusiasm from WILU delegates and beyond, and our presentation was followed by what Stewart and I would later qualify as a tsunami of participatory interest. Numerous post-presentation conversations and a deluge of subsequent email queries from practitioners across North America resulted in an expansion of the journal’s original pool of reviewers, which fortuitously helped to accommodate an equally unexpected flow of manuscript submissions.

I share this early history of CIL because a remarkably high percentage of the reviewers who signed on during those formative years remain in that critical role as we conclude the journals’ thirteenth year of publication. Our reviewers are exceptionally loyal and caring experts in this space, and the same can be maintained for those who joined the board in the intervening years, stepping in for our reviewers emeriti who transitioned away from the journal for the single reason of their much-deserved retirements. There may be a variety of general factors that contribute to the abiding relationships that CIL editors have with members of this board. In preparation for this editorial, I studied a noteworthy sample of the journal’s internal reviewer correspondences; above all, they are characterized by insight,
experience, and domain knowledge, but there are also striking indications of professional attachment and affection for the journal, and earnest philosophies relative to scholarly publishing and open access. Whether this is unusual for a review board in today’s environment, I cannot say, but I prefer to think of the dynamics described here as those that define the focused and closely-knit community of practice.

The original intent for this editorial was to laud our reviewers as the fabric of CIL and, more universally, as the shapers of the field’s professional literature. To these points, I recently received a handful of manuscript evaluations for a paper that was undergoing peer review, and it dawned on me as I read them that there was an argument to be made for open peer review that has less to do with building capacity in the open research environment and more to do with showcasing the remarkable work of CIL’s manuscript reviewers. Beyond that, however, the latest batch of manuscript evaluations helped me to realize more fully that my co-editors and I are consistently inspired in the company of our devoted reviewers. I can assure the CIL readership that after thirteen years of advancing this open access journal experiment, the steady boost of energy and motivation is sincerely appreciated.

In closing, co-editor-in-chief April Schweikhard fittingly suggested that we salute all the reviewers who contributed to the development of volume thirteen by listing them here. On behalf of the editorial team, I thank these remarkable members of the CIL family for another successful year of publication: Alex R. Hodges, Alison Hicks, Allison Hosier, Allison V. Level, Amanda K. Izenstark, Amanda Kathryn Nichols Hess, Amy Stewart-Mailhiot, Andrea Wilcox Brooks, Andrew Walsh, Ann Roselle, Benjamin Andrus, Beth Blakesley, Caroline Cason Barratt, Christopher P. Schipper, Courtney Lundrigan, Crystal Goldman, Elaine Marie Reeves, Elizabeth Galoozis, Ellen Bahr, Erin L. Ellis, Gabriela Sonntag, Jane Nichols, Janet L. Goosney, Jenny Dale, Jolanda Pieta van Arnhem, Karen Bordonaro, Laurie A. Prange, Leslie Hurst, Lisa Hinchliffe, Lisa R. Coats, Lynn D. Lampert, Mary Francis, Maura A. Smale, Michael Brueckner, Monica Twork, Nancy Wootton Colborn, Nicole Pagowsky, Polly D. Boruff-Jones, Rebecca Jackson, Rebecca Kate Miller, Robert Detmering, Rosalind Tedford, Rosemary Green, Sarah Clark, Sarah Maureen Fabian, Sarah McCord, Sebastian Krutkowski, Sheril Hook, Susan Avery, Terry Sklar Taylor, Theresa G. Burress, Tiffany R. Walsh, Trudi E. Jacobson, Wendy Holliday, and Willow Elizabeth Fuchs.