

Notes from the Field Author Guidelines and Peer Review Process

Spring 2026

Notes from the Field highlights practical lessons from the front lines of teaching with primary sources in thematic series of open peer-reviewed articles. Contributors will write about the theory and practice of teaching with primary sources, broadly relating topics to educators and practitioners from all types of institutions, teaching all kinds of students. The various series within the section will explore issues and concerns relevant to practitioners at all levels.

The editors welcome submissions and contributions from librarians, archivists, museum educators, and all other cultural heritage professionals teaching with primary sources.

Length, Tone, and Style

Contributions should be 1000-1100 words, submitted in electronic format as a Word or Word compatible document as an email attachment to the Lead Editor, Joe Lueck, at lueckj@union.edu

The ideal post will explore the writer's practice in order to reflect on issues relevant to the larger profession. Instead of adopting a case study approach, writers should look for universality and applicability of the post subject to other TPS instructional environments, while also acknowledging possible differences. Writers may argue for a particular approach, strategy, or development in the field, with practical suggestions on implementation. Content should be unique, original, and not previously published.

Writers should address a general audience of information and cultural heritage professionals and educators, and need not use a formal and academic tone. However, submissions should follow the Chicago Manual of Style and include complete citations where required.

Photographs, Illustrations, and Graphics

All submissions should be accompanied by at least one image related to the article.

Photographs, illustrations, images, and graphics should be submitted electronically as a separate attachment to the email to the editor. File size must be a maximum of 2MB. Acceptable formats are JPG, PNG, or GIF. Caption and credit(s) should be provided for all images submitted. If possible, authors should use images that are in the public domain or available under a Creative Commons license.

Copyright

Notes from the Field is an open access publication. Authors retain the copyright to their works. In alignment with ACRL Publications, reuse of the published work in those publications will be governed by a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0; <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>). This license lets others remix, tweak, and build upon the Work non-commercially; although new works must acknowledge the original publication and be non-commercial, they do not have to be licensed on the same terms. Visit the Creative Commons website (<http://creativecommons.org/>) to learn more about their licensing options.

Contributor bio

All authors are asked to include a brief (1-3 line) biography with their submission, to be included at the conclusion of their article.

Peer Review

Notes from the Field uses a **blind peer review process**. Manuscripts are submitted in electronic format as a Word or Word compatible document as an email attachment to the Lead Editor. The Assigned NFTF Editor will distribute the Word document to the peer reviewer.

Peer reviewers will review submissions for clarity of content, consistency of tone and voice, overall instructiveness, and utility to the profession. A peer reviewer might suggest or request more details or specifics, further elucidation, rewriting for clarity, copy edits, and/or grammar changes.

Peer reviewers will be solicited from a reviewer pool consisting of members of the TPS Facilitation Team, current and former members of the RBMS Instruction and Outreach Committee, and members of the broader TPS community. NFTF Editors will make a call for a peer reviewer to this group using a private, designated Slack channel and direct email when a post is ready for review. All identifying information, including the author's name and the topic of the post, will be excluded from this call and only provided to a reviewer once they have contacted the editors with an expression of interest.

Peer reviewers will have 1 week for their part of the peer review process, responding with feedback directly in the Word document. The Assigned NFTF Editor will also provide feedback

in the Word doc. Following this 1 week period, the NFTF Editor will anonymize the comments and feedback of the peer reviewer and editor and share this version with the author. The author will then have 1 week to respond to feedback and make revisions. After these two weeks of peer review, the Assigned Editor will start drafting the piece as a post on the TPS Collective site.

Life Cycle of a Peer Review Document

1. Submission of Document

After an author has finished a draft of a contribution for the blog, it should be saved as a Word document with a filename formatted as follows:

AuthorLastName-Abbreviated Post Title-Date of Submission

The author should then send this file in an email to the Lead Editor, Anastasia Armendariz (ajarm@uci.edu).

2. Acknowledgement of submission

The Lead Editor will acknowledge the author's submission via email upon receipt of the document. They will then assign the submission to a member of the editorial team. This Assigned Editor will be the author's main point of contact throughout the rest of the publication process.

3. Selection of Peer Reviewers

The NFTF Editor assigned to the post will select two peer reviewers from a pool of volunteers. The author, title, and subject of a submission will not be revealed to any members of this pool until they have agreed to act as reviewers for that submission.

4. Initial Peer Review and Comment Anonymization

The NFTF editor assigned to the submission will upload your document to a Google Drive folder. The editor and peer reviewer(s) assigned to the submission will begin to read and comment on your submission. They will have up to 1 week to make notes, suggestions, and requests for clarification using the Google Docs or Word “Comment” feature.

At the end of this two-week period, the file and comments will be downloaded into a Word file. Comments will be stripped of all identifying information. This anonymized file will be returned to the author via email in the form of a PDF.

5. Author Response and Revision Period

After the author receives the file with comments, they will have 1 week to reflect on the feedback they have received, to discuss the submission with the editor who has been assigned to them, and to make any changes they see fit.

At the end of the two-week period, the author should email a final draft of their submission to the editor who has been assigned to them.

6. Editorial Acknowledgement

The Assigned NFTF Editor will acknowledge receipt of the final draft via email and will also alert the rest of the editorial team that the post is ready for publication, pending formatting and a final review.

7. Publication Formatting

The Assigned NFTF Editor will insert the text of the final draft into the Wordpress site. Although the author is welcome to discuss formatting preferences with the editor, the editor might also make decisions about pull quotes and image formatting in order to match the style and tone of previous blog posts. This may occur up to one week after the final draft has been received by the editor.

8. Final Review

When the document has been formatted, the author's editor will contact other members of the editorial team to initiate the final review. The Lead Editor will check the final document to ensure that no formatting or typographical errors have been missed.

9. Publication

Upon completion of the final review, the submission will be published. The author will be notified via email when the post becomes visible on the blog.

10. File Retention

After publication, the Notes from the Field editorial team will delete all but the finalized draft of the author's submission and accompanying images. The editorial team will retain this copy as a backup, but all non-anonymized and commented drafts generated during the peer review process will be deleted.