

## **JSCM governance processes – last updated May 2021.**

This document reflects the mission, policies and governance of The Journal of Supply Chain Management as of May 19, 2021. It is assumed that this document will change and evolve as The Journal does the same. As those changes occur this document will be updated.

This document addresses two potentially competing values that are central to successfully editing The Journal of Supply Chain Management. The first value is that editors are accountable to The Journal's owner, Wiley, as well as the community of scholars who support The Journal as readers, authors, reviewers, associate editors and editors. The second value is that the editors need to be autonomous to do their jobs effectively.

What this ultimately means is that the editors of JSCM have day to day responsibility for The Journal, but that the community plays a role in determining the direction of JSCM. Changes in JSCM's mission or direction must be made with the input of the wider community and the community must have recourse if they feel that the editors are not effectively leading The Journal.

To ensure this occurs this document addresses three interrelated areas; operations, strategic direction and appointing new editors.

***Operations and individual papers:*** The Editors are responsible for JSCM's day-to-day operations and this document does not prescribe how the operations should be managed. However, it is assumed that the operations will serve the community and continue to be transparent, fair and effective. In addition, JSCM via its publisher Wiley, is a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and JSCM always endeavors to follow COPE's best practices in publishing ethics. If a member of the community believes that the process has been mismanaged or did not follow COPE guidelines in a specific instance, then they should inform the editors. If a satisfactory solution cannot be worked out with the editors, then this member of the community should inform one or both of the ombudspersons, who will determine a solution in line with the COPE principals. The editors will abide by these decisions. The ombudspersons will also determine if issues are becoming systemic (see next). To make sure all members of the community are aware of their rights and recourse, JSCM's virtual presences will be kept updated to clearly highlight membership in COPE, who the current ombudspersons are, and how members of the community can pursue recourse if needed.

***Strategic direction and systemic issues:*** To ensure the community's voice is heard on a regular basis and to make appointing new editors transparent and fair the following will occur:

1. Two ombudspersons will be appointed. The ombudspersons will select new editors, provide a link between the editors and the wider community, and solicit feedback from the community on the direction of JSCM and the work

being done by the editors. The ombudspersons will be chosen by the editors and serve 3-year (renewable) terms.

2. A search committee comprised of 6 people will recommend the new editors, who must receive final approval from Wiley to be appointed. The committee will represent the global nature of JSCM and be comprised of the 2 ombudspersons and 4 others chosen by the ombudspersons. The committee members should include:
  - a. At least one past editor of JSCM or if not possible a different equally impactful journal
  - b. One or more of JSCM's current Regional Editors
  - c. AEs or ERB members at JSCM

A committee member can have more than one of the above attributes (e.g. both an AE and past editor) and committee members will be selected from a list of past editors, regional editors, AEs and ERB members provided by the editors to the ombudspersons.

3. The editors will schedule 2 or 3 virtual meetings a year to engage with the AE community. The editors will continue to hold AE meetings at major conferences (e.g. AOM/ EUROMA) but holding virtual meetings makes it easier to engage with all AEs. AE's will in return promise to attend at least one virtual meeting a year to continue as AE's. In years when one or more editors are being replaced, the ombudspersons will engage with the AEs either via this mechanism or another.
4. The editors will also survey the Editorial Review Board yearly on the direction of The Journal. The survey will also remind ERB members that if they would rather give feedback to the ombudspersons they can / should. The timing of this survey will be such that the results of this feedback can be used in selecting new editors and or to inform discussions about the direction or mission of JSCM.

***Appointing new editors:*** To create continuity and to make transitions easier, editors will be replaced on a rolling basis. Editors will serve a term of three years (which can be renewed for a further 2) and one editor will be replaced each year (assuming a team of three). To make the process less onerous this will be done biannually (e.g. two new editors appointed every other year) with scope for exiting editors and new editors to stagger their start / end times to suit their needs. The search committee will manage this process and Wiley has final say on if a person is to be appointed as editor. Current or continuing editors will have a very limited role in this process. Specifically, continuing editors will have the right to veto potential future editors. This process will be run by the search committee and it is not this document's intent to specify exactly how that is to occur.

However, feedback from the AEs and ERB members (and the wider community when deemed useful) should be considered prior to starting the process to replace an editor(s). This feedback can then inform the search for appointees in terms of needed attributes, a change in direction, or both.

In addition, the process should result in a team of co-editors that reflects the JSCM community on multiple dimensions. First, JSCM encourages empirical

research on a very wide range of supply chain topics and the editorial team should be comprised of scholars whose broad expertise spans internal, upstream, downstream and wider network views. Second, JSCM's community is global, and the editorial team should be comprised of empirical supply chain scholars who represent that global community. Third, the methodological expertise of the editorial team, where possible, should also cover the range of empirical tools used to study supply chain management. The process of rolling co-editors off on a regular basis may make it impossible to achieve all of these goals all of the time. However, imbalances should be short term and rectified when the next appointments are made.

Finally, the following should guide the process of appointing new editors:

### ***Attributes of The Journal of Supply Chain Management***

1. The mission – which is currently that research published in JSCM is empirical and makes a contribution to theory - does not change unless the community agrees via a process lead by ombudspersons. JSCM currently publishes 20-30 high impact papers a year, hence they are generally going to contribute to theory. Exceptions are currently made for the occasional note. Finally, there is an expectation that the editors will continue to pursue ways of disseminating via social media, alternative formats such as videos and – when applicable- to other audiences such as practitioners as well.
2. The boundaries of what is SCM research, are wide both in terms of level of analysis and if it is upstream, downstream, internal (including traditional operations) or the entire network.
3. AEs and reviewers currently provide developmental reviews which authors' have rightly come to expect. This also requires continued support in the form of workshops, the Junior ERB and so on.
4. JSCM faces fewer hurdles getting papers reviewed than many other journals because of the combination of a high desk reject rate and not sending revised manuscripts back to reviewers. Reviewers know they are only going to see a paper once and it will likely have a relatively high probability of eventual publication; hence they generally provide JSCM with high quality reviews. Similarly, having 3 reviewers per-paper instead of 2 makes a difference both in the quality of the feedback and in reducing the likelihood of conflicting direction (or rather the AE has to weigh in). Because the current processes are viewed as effective, they should only change / evolve with the input of the AE's and the ombudspersons.

### ***Attributes of individual editors***

1. Willing to commit to JSCM's conflict of interest code which includes not publishing in JSCM during the term as Co-Editor and erring on the side of caution when handling potential conflicts of interest.
2. Must have the time to commit 1-2 days a week to JSCM. Co-Editors at JSCM are very involved in the day to day operations of The Journal and the current structure of Co-Editors rolling on and off individually means that there is little scope to have one member of the editorial team take on a mainly strategic or promotional role for their entire term.

3. Must be a team player and capable of communicating with the entire JSCM community.
4. Recognized globally for their supply chain management scholarship.
5. Should have administrative support in some form.
6. Preference given to people who have published in JSCM or served as an associate editor or member of the editorial review board of The Journal.

***Attributes of the Team:***

1. JSCM takes an expansive view of supply chain management research and the team of editors must reflect that.
2. JSCM is a global journal and the team of editors must reflect that.
3. The team must have the administrative support required to both process manuscripts and continue with the promotional efforts started in 2017.
4. Balance in terms of methodological expertise is also valued.