

Horological Times Advisory Committee Report for the period of Aug. 2015- Aug. 2016
Submitted by: Karel Ebenstreit, Chairman of the committee, Sept.14, 2016.

The mission of Horological Times and the role of the committee

The committee is charged with 3 tasks:

Objectives/Goals

- 1. Continue to work to increase circulation and advertising revenue.**
- 2. Seek out potential authors for magazine articles.**
- 3. Review submitted articles for content and accuracy before publication.**

The editorial mission statement of Horological Times is:

The Horological Times is the official publication of the American Watchmakers-Clockmakers Institute. Our readers represent watchmakers and clockmakers, retailers, and industry professionals in the United States and beyond. The Horological Times is the primary means for the Institute to communicate with its membership. The Horological Times will provide information on recent industry developments and will also promote employment opportunities and information on parts, tools and services.

Articles are published with the purpose of:

- **Increasing the horologist's technical knowledge and profitability.**
- **Establishing the best standards and practices of the horological community.**
- **Furthering the advancement of horology through research.**
- **Disseminating information about the latest tools and technology.**
- **Transferring knowledge gained by experience from one generation of watchmaker to future generations.**

The Mission statement may need some revisions.

It is believed by the committee that to increase advertising revenue (to get more companies to place an add in the magazine), advertisement of the sale of generic parts should be allowed if possible. This was still applicable this year.

This period, it was again difficult to find potential article contributors although the remuneration was increased last year. HT committee members contributed this year with numerous articles which should be commended.

Some committee members still feel that we should be publishing technical articles about servicing those modern watches for which parts are available to all AWCI members, such as Seiko & Citizen, Ronda for example and articles on vintage watch

and clock restoration which is another area that is becoming more important to our members as the parts supply dries up.

Following guidelines were used when reviewing the articles by the committee members:

1. Is the article technically and historically accurate?
2. Does the author follow the standards & practices set forth by AWCI? (See S&P Documents)
3. Are there any safety concerns which should be addressed?
4. Does the topic have value to our membership?
5. If the article discusses new products or technology, is it a sales pitch or does it discuss the value of the technological features?
6. If the article represents the results of a research project are they presented in a method consistent with the scientific method? Is their sufficient information given for the experiment to be repeated and confirmed by our membership?
7. Do you have any other concerns or comments?
8. Should the article be published? Yes, Yes with revisions, No

The committee reviewed approx. 150 articles submitted to us by Donna Hardy during the year.

The members of the Horological Committee in 2015-2016 year were:
Karel Ebenstreit, Chairman, Robert Porter, David Fahrenholtz, Bob Little,
Paul Corn and Andrew DeKeyser. Andrew DeKeyser joined the HT committee Apr.13
2015 .

Wesley Simmons was a member until he resigned in May 2016.

On July 29, 2016 Daniel Benson, Matthew Schloemer, Dale LaDue and Hannah Mancill joined the HT committee.

On Sept. 23, 2016 HT committee participated in a conference call debating the way articles should be reviewed. Each member made some proposals and the summary was produced by Chairman as follows:

First I would like to give my opinions on the committee's involvement.

As you all know we all are volunteers that have many other responsibilities and need to make money to be able to live and feed the family.

Therefore, we have to be very efficient in how we handle our tasks while being able to provide valuable assessment on quality and usefulness of the articles that AWCI publishes every month.

We do have a mission statement for HT committee and we produced guidelines which should help us to assess each article without forgetting any one of them.

Let's not forget what our final objective is – have good articles published in HT that people will be happy to read and will learn from.

How we will achieve that is up to us, but after so many years of being on this committee, I prefer this to be very simple but effective. Sometimes simple “OK to print” is as good as any 2 page assessment. However, when the article appears to be controversial, then we have to solve it in a proper manner. How, I will list it below per your comments.

In a perfect world, all articles to be printed should in best scenario receive 100% of YES to be printed.

If NO or YES with revisions is suggested, then the proper explanation and supporting information must be given.

If there are concerns about the article, I do not think that percentage is a good way of judging the acceptability of articles, since there will always be different number of people reviewing and not much time available to do any calculation, so I propose to just see how many people agree or disagree with printing the article.

There should not be any unsafe articles printed, there must be all in agreement on that.

If there is one reject, the chairman should make decision on how to follow up on that.

Members should be familiar with their group's S&P document and we should strive that the article is within these guidelines. There may be some exceptions, but that will have to be discussed between the group and the writer and the chairman should make a final decision.

If there are more than one rejects, the articles should be returned to the writer with our comments asking for the revisions.

Other than safety and S&P issues, the other criteria should be passed by at least 5 members.

With the expertise this committee has, there is no need for Education Committee to be asked for their opinion. Within last 10 years as I remember, it was not needed and I do not think it would solve disagreement any better than what we can do by our-self.

Our comments to the writer must be stated very diplomatically with comments that should help the writer with the solutions. Also, we should encourage the writers to submit more articles. Do not forget that to write the article it takes a lot of time and courage. It is much harder to write an article than to criticize it.

The Editor should make sure that the comments are in line with decency and diplomacy since she/he is the one sending comments back to the writer.

I would like to clarify here that the personal comments that we sometimes make in our replies are not to be sent to the writer as a critique, but we have to make sure that it is clear to the Editor.

Once member writes "Good to print" or "YES print", then anything after that are just personal comments or observations that should not be sent to the writer. Example, when I commented on dial not that nice or markers and date windows missing were only comments aimed to other members.

Timeliness: It was proposed that we answer within 3 days from the time article is sent to us and if comments must be discussed, then it should be done within a week. Well, this depends on availability of members, which may never be 100%. It also depends on the Editor's need, so we should be told if there is a 3 day need or one week or any other time that the reply is needed. It should be up to the Editor to make that information available and members should meet that the best way they can.

All the articles should be marked in the Subject as W(atch), C(clock) or B(oth). We know who belongs in what category, then W person does not have to comment on C articles and similarly with C. That way number of e-mails will be eliminated helping us and Editor to be more effective.

Can Editor use: W3 or C3 in Subject for 3 days request, C7 or B7 for a week request for comments?

If a person will be away or if he cannot comment in a timely manner, courtesy message should be sent to Editor.

One reason why we increased the number of HT committee members was because not all can be available all the time for whatever reason. One thing we must avoid is a loss of a member because of stress due to the overwork of missed deadlines. We just lost one few months ago.

Accepting that, if there is one member not available at any time, we still will have enough brain power for article reviews.

Please comment on this proposal, remind me if I forgot anything we discussed and vote YES or Revise with explanation. Majority of acceptance will be finalized and used as a guide for us in the future.

I thank you all for your devotion to this committee, for kind and friendly co-operation.

Karel Ebenstreit, CMW, CC21

Chairman HT Committee

Sept.11, 2016