

C4DISC Steering Committee

Running Agenda and Minutes from 8/22/22

Handy links

C4 DISC website | C4DISC Drive space | Minutes from earlier steering committee meetings
Steering Committee list email: c4disc@googlegroups.com

Current Members as of August 2022:

Melanie Schlosser (LPC, convener, non-voting), Brit Stamey (ISMTE, treasurer), Peter Berkery (AUPresses), Gillian Harrison Cain, Gordon E. Smith, Patricia Baskin, Ed Pentz, Ally Laird (LPC), Jordan Graham, Rebecca McLeod (NISO), Bernie Folan (OASPA), Alex Mendonça (SciELO), Charlotte Roh, Bev Acreman (UKSG), Alice Meadows (SSP/NISO), Heather Staines (ALPSP/Delta Think)

3/27/23

Attendees:

- Members 14 / Partners 21 / Adoptees 127 (Updates) (Vanesa)
 - Vanesa to send an email out to SterCo informing them about new adoptee and partner. Also send an email for the new member for approval
- Working group updates
 - WE Project budget request (Melanie D)
 - Patty met with the Inclusive Language guidelines—they are ready to stepback and move forward with next steps. They also have someone in mind (Sabrina Ashwell) to continue working on the document now that the guidelines are complete.
 - What is the process to create a Maintenance committee for continuing work and/or maintaining and updating content

- Think about updating resources– a bigger conversation –what is the workflow for continuing maintenance on documents after the working group has completed their work.
 - What is the framework/process for accepting/declining budgets for the working group tasks?--just voting during the meeting until another process is created when there are more requests
 - New working group suggestions
 - **Please add comments to the decision document before the meeting**
 - Toolkit for Accessible Publishing
 - Decision:
 - Supplier Diversity Handbook
 - Decision:
 - Request from SSP DEIA Committee to publish toolkit: “Building Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in Peer Review: A Focused Toolkit for Editors and Publishers” (Melanie D)
 - Strategic priorities
 - Communities of Practice (Bernie)
 - This is now in the working group updates list going forward
 - Communications strategy (Bernie)
 - Quick update–several meetings have happened where Vanesa and Bernie are getting more clarity of tasks/roles
 - Communications role and making sure that there is not much overlap on the communication messages
 - Looking at social channels and will begin communications strategy/process moving forward
 - Bernie would like Steering Committee input as she creates the strategy/process –she wants to use the Google Group email for the Steering Committee.
 - Recommendation is that she emails out the doc for feedback– meetings will not always be necessary
 - Also reaching out to Vanesa for feedback
 - Content strategy (Melanie S)
 - Draft strategy (**please quickly review before the meeting**)
 - Discussion topic: How to approach updating and versioning?
 - Are our publications meant to be ‘living’ or ‘snapshot’ documents? Does it depend on the doc? How do we decide?

(Comments/feedback–Publications in this case are the Toolkits. We might not know if it's an ever changing document until the work begins. In other situations, maybe there is a hybrid process–stand alone or continuously update– think about what the review process looks like for docs that are not a living doc–maybe in 3-5 years there will need to be changes/regular updates as time goes on–Steering Committee will be in charge of this review. We need to be able to structure a maintenance committee at the onset of the work so there are no surprises when the continued work is requested. All of the work that is being done should be obvious that there will need to be continued work–it's a matter of how often the changes/maintenance needs to be done. How do we determine when more maintenance is needed? It will change based on the doc and the work. There should be someone in the role to do this work– not necessarily someone in the Steering Committee–perhaps an Ambassador/Editor –someone who will check in on the doc as time goes on. Regular review is important. How are you managing a living doc– are you updating sections or the entire doc. It should be clear what has been changed as the doc continues to be edited. How are you managing the changes to the changes as the document continues to “lives”. This is where the difference between Editor and an Ambassador. **Needs**– an overall framework– what it is, what does it look, and how does it work. How do we put it to work for docs that are out there and docs that are in the works) **Two Asks**–Steering Committee members are responsible for the regular cadence of this review process and then figuring out the Ambassador role.

- Someone who is willing to begin this new process– Rebecca, Melanie S., and Melanie D.
- Vanesa to setup a half hour meeting btw Melanie S. and Rebecca S. McLeod to begin this work– and maybe they will loop in Melanie D.
- Patty will be **piloting** this process for Editor/Ambassador–recruit help and restructure the committee for the DEI Language

- What mechanisms/structures are available for updating existing resources?
 - Continue original working group
 - New working group
 - Other?
- How do we balance creating new resources with updating existing resources?

Workplace Equity Project Budget Request:

Requested Amount: \$1,306.51 to cover 4 users for one year through a "Team Advantage Plan"

This plan allows for 4 separate user accounts to be joined within a 'team.' Each account would have access to build and edit the survey. Account access can easily be changed if one user needs to be replaced with another. This structure removes the limitation of two-factor identification through a single account. Four accounts for this project could cover the WE Survey lead, the survey builder, and two data analysts. Platform to be used is Survey Monkey.

Alternative configurations are offered below for price comparison.

- Team plan with **5 individual accounts:** \$1,633.13 / year
- Team plan with **3 individual accounts**, plus two additional people who could comment on and view the survey but not edit it: \$1,371.83 / year

Voting Outcome—All members of the Steering Committee voted yes on the requested budget for the WE Survey

SSP Toolkit:

“Building Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in Peer Review: A Focused Toolkit for Editors and Publishers” (Working Title)

By SSP DEIA Committee Project Volunteers:

Sue Harris (Project Co-Lead), Shaina Lange (Project Co-Lead and Committee Co-Chair), Allison Leung (Committee Co-Chair), Chenyue Jiao, Megan McCarty, and Lillian Selonick, with contributions from Robin Baldwin (Former Project Co-Lead), Patty Baskin, Alice Meadows, and Damita Snow

Editorial boards that reflect the broader society of which they are a part are more equitable and allow for a plurality of perspectives, counteract biases, and promote breadth of content and various methods of acquiring knowledge. Over the past several decades, women and people of color have been underrepresented on editorial boards in proportion to their authorship contributions to various disciplines (Liu et al, 2023a, 2023b). As publishers and editors increasingly share the aim of correcting these imbalances to foster an equitable, participatory publishing environment, questions have arisen as to how best to achieve this.

The SSP DEIA Committee introduces this focused toolkit of resources to support publishers and editors in building inclusivity on editorial boards and fostering equity in the peer review process. It aims to equip a broad audience of interested publishers and editors across the global scholarly communications industry with valuable, concise, and manageable DEIA tactics, complementing existing and future C4DISC resources including the Toolkits for Equity. The toolkit is presented in five sections offering actionable steps to (a) develop an inclusive culture and mission, (b) guide the collection and reporting of demographic data, (c) recruit broadly, (d) create pathways for reviewer participation, and (e) increase equity in the peer review process. This work was guided by the belief that equitable representation at all stages of the editorial process is essential and that opportunities for discovery, authenticity, and self-correction are more available when the people who edit, write, and participate in scholarly endeavors are systematically connected rather than segregated in the publishing venture (Medin & Bang, 2014; Roberts et al., 2020).

- Steering Committee members were in support of this work and look forward to the outcome. It is another good tool for the community.
- Maybe think about the larger ramifications of publishing this doc from LPC and not C4DISC but we can talk about this later if more docs come into play in the future.
- Outcome vote– vote on this is Yes from all members.