Presentation overview

1. Editorial Board
2. Types of article review and selection
3. Copyright
4. Journal production
5. Indexation and dissemination
Getting Started: Basic checklist

- Criteria for articles
  - E.g. length, scope, subject etc.

- Succession planning, transitioning and documentation
  - See this checklist

- Will the journal screen for plagiarism? If so, how?

- How will you solicit articles?
Editorial Boards and Getting Started
Editorial Board Structure

• Sample Positions
  • Content & Direction
    • Editor-in-Chief
    • Managing Editor
    • Editors; Section Editors; Associate Editors
    • Editorial Board members at large
  • Production
    • Layout Editors
    • Copyeditors
    • Proofreaders
## Editorial responsibilities: content and direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Responsible for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editor-in-Chief</td>
<td>• Strategic direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Setting policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Managing editorial team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Editor</td>
<td>• Handling day-to-day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensures production timelines are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>• Reviews submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Locates peer reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decides what to accept/decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Board</td>
<td>• Provides feedback on the journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May help locate peer reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;Sounding board&quot; for the journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Submissions policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Peer review guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Promoting the journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Editorial responsibilities: content and direction**
- **Editor-in-Chief**
  - Strategic direction
  - Setting policies
  - Managing editorial team
- **Managing Editor**
  - Handling day-to-day
  - Ensures production timelines are met
- **Editor**
  - Reviews submissions
  - Locates peer reviewers
  - Decides what to accept/decline
- **Editorial Board**
  - Provides feedback on the journal
  - May help locate peer reviewers
  - "Sounding board" for the journal
    - Submissions policies
    - Peer review guidelines
    - Scope
  - Promoting the journal
### Editorial responsibilities: production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Responsible for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copyeditor</td>
<td>• Ensures submissions meet style of the journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Checks submissions for clarity of writing, grammar etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout Editor</td>
<td>• Sets layout for articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proofreader</td>
<td>• Checks final proof for errors etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:*

These may not be separate positions at a journal; editors may also serve in these capacities.
Activity: Who does what?

At your journal, who is responsible for these tasks?

- Accepting submissions
- Selects/ "hires" team members
- Locating reviewers
- Promotes the journal
- Checking the final proof
- Doing layout on the articles
- Providing strategic oversight
- Sets submission criteria
- Ensures deadlines are met
- Sends the journal out to be printed
- Reports to parent organization (e.g. student association)
Review process

How does a journal select and review submissions?
Types of review

• Editorial review
• Panel/Committee
• Double blind peer review
• Single blind peer review
• Open review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of review</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Editorial review  | Assessment of an article undertaken by a member of the editorial staff.    | • Streamlined, one person makes decision  
• More commons for certain types of submissions (e.g. literary)                                       | • May be biased and invidual as per the editor’s tastes                                            |
| Panel review      | Assessment of an article undertaken by a committee, panel of editorial board members etc. | • Reaches a stronger threshold of consensus (as opposed to one opinion)                             | • More effort; difficulty reaching consensus  
• Need firm criteria for assessing submissions                                                       |
| Single blind      | Reviewers know the names of the authors but the authors do not know who are the reviewers. | • As the reviewer is anonymous, they may provide feedback without fear of a negative reaction  
• May be able to use information about the author in their assessment                               | • Potential bias on the part of the reviewer. Reviewer may evaluate an article on the basis of the author rather than the article itself. |
| Double blind      | Reviewers do not know the names of the authors nor do the authors know who are the reviewers. | • Reduces potential reviewer bias  
• Provides reviewer anonymity                                                                      | • Reviewer does not have access to information about the author that may assist in completing the review |
| Open review       | Names of both the authors and peer reviewers are available and the review may be made publicly-available. See BMJ. | • Improved transparency; the reviewers may take their work more seriously/ refrain from unnecessary negative feedback | • Reviewers may fear consequences for completing negative reviews                                  |
Peer review process

1. **Author submits article**
2. **Editor reviews submission**
3. **Editors sends to peer review**
4. **Peer reviewers make recommendations**
   - 1. Accept
   - 2. Revisions required
   - 3. Resubmit for review
   - 4. Decline

- **Submission is declined**
- **Submission requires extensive revisions**
- **Submission requires minor revisions**
- **Submission is accepted and published**
- **Editor reviews submission**
Editorial review process / Panel review process

Author submits item → Editor reviews submission → Author revises submission → Editor reviews submission

Submission is declined

Submission requires minor revisions → Author revises submission → Editor reviews submission

Submission is accepted and published

Submission is declined
Discussion

What is your journal’s review process?

Does it adequately meet your journal’s needs?
Activity

In groups of two, write out the primary criteria for articles to be accepted in your journal.
Submission review process

- Criteria to be a peer reviewer / editor
  - E.g. a grad student, a student with a certain GPA etc.
- Guidelines or rubric for peer reviewers / editors
  - How will they assess articles? What is the evaluation criteria?
    - E.g. writing style, organization, research synthesis etc.
- How much time do they have to do their review?
Activity

Take the criteria from the first exercise, and develop a rubric for reviewers/editors.

Add any additional criteria you think is relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria:</th>
<th>Needs improvement</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPS</td>
<td>WEEKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDITOR REVIEW</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER REVIEW</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDITOR REVIEW</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR CHANGES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDITOR REVIEW*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTION (e.g. copy edit, layout, proofreading)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*at this point may be sent back out to review or more revisions requested
Sample 6-month timeframe (editorial/panel review)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS</th>
<th>WEEKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDITOR REVIEW</td>
<td>1-2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR CHANGES</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDITOR REVIEW</td>
<td>1-2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTION (e.g. copy edit, layout, proofreading)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* at this point may be sent back out to review or more revisions requested
* this may take longer if it’s a panel
Copyright
The three sides to copyright

Journal  Author  Reader
The three sides of copyright

1. Permissions
   • Is the journal using images?
     • If so, are they created by your authors or taken from another source?
   • Is the journal providing proper attribution? E.g. image source, creator etc.
Getting images from other sources (e.g. the web)?

• If not author-created, permission or license required
  • Authors should be informed that this is their responsibility!

• Looking for openly-licensed images? See the resource list at: https://mcgill.ca/copyright/resources/images

Images

Where to find images

Public domain (CC0) image sites

There are a number of searchable sites offering downloadable, high resolution images under a CC0 (Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication) licence. This licence means that the creator of the work has dedicated the work to the public domain by waiving all their rights to the work worldwide under copyright law. You can copy, modify, distribute and these photos, even for commercial purposes, all without asking permission, or providing attribution. To model good practice, you may wish to give credit to the creator anyhow, but it is not necessary under the terms of the licence.

Some good sites in this category are:

• Pixabay - site with over 680,000 free photos, vector graphics and illustrations. Results can be filtered by colour, size, orientation and subject; images can be downloaded in various sizes. Note: The top row of search results consists of sponsored images which are not offered under the CC0 licence.

• Pexels - lots of high quality, hi-res stock photos. Images can be downloaded in various sizes.
Three sides of copyright (cont’d)

2. **Author agreements**
   - Who owns copyright of the articles?
     - Where will this information be stated?
   - **Author agreements**
     - Have authors agreed to have their materials published with the journal?
       - This is **REALLY IMPORTANT IF IT WILL BE ONLINE**
   - Where will permissions or agreements be stored for posterity?
Publishing Copyright 101

¹Right to publish, copy, translate, and distribute the work...and authorize others to do so
Author agreements

• Two primary copyright models for journals:
  1. Author retains copyright and licenses right to publish to journal
  2. Author transfers copyright to the journal
• We typically advise journals to follow #1.
  • Benefits:
    • Permits authors to retain the rights to their work
    • Journal does not deal with permissions
  • Drawbacks: Limits what the journal can do with the work in the future without expressly seeking permission from the author.
3. **How will the articles be licensed to readers?**

- Will depend on author agreement
  - E.g. How have the authors agreed to have their work distributed?

- This tells readers what they are permitted to do with the articles
  - E.g.
  - Can they share them?
  - Translate them?
  - Repost them on their own websites etc.?
  - **Note:** Default is author maintains copyright and no permissions are given.

- Journals may choose one of several [Creative Commons' licenses](https://creativecommons.org/licenses)
## Creative Commons 101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Attribution          | BY      |       | User must:
|                      |         |       | • Give credit   |
|                      |         |       | • Provide a link to the license |
|                      |         |       | • Indicate if changes were made. |
| Non-Commercial       | NC      |       | User may not use the material for commercial purposes. |
| Share Alike          | SA      |       | If users remix, transform, or build upon the material, they must distribute the work under the same license as the original. |
| No Derivatives       | ND      |       | User may not remix, transform, or build upon the material. |

**Note:** CC licenses do NOT limit uses otherwise allowed by limitations and exceptions to copyright (e.g. linking, fair dealing, etc.)

**Source:** [Creative Commons at UBC](http://creativecommons.org).
Journal Production
Sample 6-month timeframe (editorial/panel review)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS</th>
<th>WEEKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDITOR REVIEW</td>
<td>1-2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR CHANGES</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDITOR REVIEW#</td>
<td>1-2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTION (e.g. copy edit, layout, proofreading)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* at this point may be sent back out to review or more revisions requested

* this may take longer if it’s a panel
Production process

Remember!
If you’re printing the articles, you’ll need to liaise off of printing production timelines.
• Who does:
  • Copyediting?
  • Layout?

• What software is used to assemble the volume? (if printing)

• Do you have a style guide (e.g. font, type size, margins etc.)?

• Journal publishing format:
  • Online
    • Which platform?
  • In print
    • Which printing company? What are their file requirements?

• How will the journal be promoted?
  • Who is responsible?
Getting your journal found
Indexing

- You may want your journal to be picked up by:
  - Google
  - Google Scholar
  - Directory of Open Access Journals
  - Subject-specific databases

Each will have its own indexing policy

- E.g. Many subject-specific databases will have specific requirements regarding number of years published etc.

- For Google Scholar, you may submit an indexing request.
  
Feedback

1. State one topic you would like to have seen covered in more detail.
2. State one topic that you felt did NOT need to be covered.
3. State one topic you felt was particularly relevant and should be included in all future presentations to this group.
4. How did you hear about this workshop? (e.g. newsletter, from a friend, direct email from us etc.)
5. Additional comments.
How can the Library help?

• We provide consultative services on:
  • Indexing
  • Copyright
  • Editorial board structure
  • Publishing platforms
Questions?

Book an individual consultation!

• Sandy Hervieux | Liaison Librarian
  • Sandy.Hervieux@mcgill.ca

• Michael David Miller | Liaison Librarian
  • Michael.david.miller@mcgill.ca

• Jessica Lange | Scholarly Communications Librarian
  • Jessica.lange@mcgill.ca

See also:

• Scholarly Publishing Guide:
  https://libraryguides.mcgill.ca/journalpublishing/home

• Author Rights Guide:
  http://libraryguides.mcgill.ca/c.php?g=518546&p=3545981