

Final Report and Recommendations
Assisting the Canadian Political Science Review
The Prairie Political Science Association
July 2018

Terms of Reference:

Motion: Be it resolved that the PPSA strike a committee to investigate, consult widely, and provide recommendations on the structure and future of the CPSR. Be it further resolved that the committee be comprised of Anthony Sayers, Heather Smith, Byron Sheldrick, and Tom McIntosh.

Moved: Jim Farney

Seconded: Linda Trimble

Vote: Passed

Ex-Officio Advisory Members: JP Lewis (APPSA); Alex Netherton (BCPSA); Graham White (ex-CJPS); Tracy Summerville (Editor, CPSR); Board (PPSA).

The committee met electronically on January 19, 2018 and otherwise worked via email.

Contents:

[Introduction](#)

[Recommendations](#)

[Detailed Recommendations](#)

[Appendix A: The Canadian Political Science Review](#)

[Appendix B: A Brief History of the Canadian Political Science Review via Mike Howlett](#)

[Appendix C: Current State of the CPSR via Editor, Tracy Summerville](#)

[Appendix D: Strategic Environment Review, CPSR](#)

[Appendix E: Initial Proposals to Assist the CPSR](#)

[Appendix F: Comments on Discussion Paper and Draft Proposals, Assisting the CPSR](#)

Introduction:

Thank you for the opportunity to consider what is an important question for the future of the *Review* and study of political science in Canada. We would like to thank all those who gave generously of their time and expertise to advise the committee in its work. It is invigorating to be part of such an engaged community. The Chair thanks committee members for their work. We respectfully submit the following report and recommendations for consideration by the Board and Association Members.

Anthony Sayers (Chair), Heather Smith, Byron Sheldrick, and Tom McIntosh. July 2018.

Recommendations:

That the PPSA

1. Help to stabilize the funding of the *Review* by working with the current editors and other regional political science associations (BCPSA, APPSA) to establish a team that would submit a grant application to the SSHRC program designed to support online journals.
2. Assist the current editors to renew the *Review's* Editorial Board by making use of its connections across the discipline and with other regional political science associations (BCPSA, APPSA).
3. Coordinate with other regional political science Associations (BCPSA, APPSA) and a reinvigorated advisory board/editorial team to stabilize the mid-term administration of the *Review*.

Detailed Recommendations:

1. Help to stabilize the funding of the *Review* by working with the current editors and other regional political science associations (BCPSA, APPSA) to establish a team that would submit a grant application to the SSHRC program designed to support online journals
 - Task a volunteer to lead a SSRHC grant application team and work with *Review* editors to submit such an application
 - See http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programmes-programmes/scholarly_journals-revues_savantes-eng.aspx
 - Note additional support for open access journals in the description of the program
 - Consider the importance of funding a journal manager as part of this grant
2. Assist the current editors to renew the *Review's* Editorial Board by making use of its connections across the discipline and with other regional political science associations (BCPSA, APPSA).
 - To consider the advantages of formal administrative links to the various Associations via a joint advisory board or provisions for association representation on a renewed editorial board.
 - Encourage broad, disciplinary representation on the Board
 - Explore novel ways of sharing workloads and raising resources
 - manuscript reviews, encouraging submissions, responsible for various sections, website etc.
3. Coordinate with other regional political science Associations (BCPSA, APPSA) and a reinvigorated advisory board/editorial team to stabilize the mid-term administration of the *Review*
 - Board members would agree to a distributed work model (manuscript reviews, encouraging submissions, responsible for various sections, website) to help stabilize the editorial processes of the *Review* in the short run and work to
 - Secure the legal and corporate status of the *Review*
 - Help establish a process for regular renewal of the editorial board
 - Build a picture of communities of interest
 - Broaden the appeal and reach of the *Review* by
 - examining its mission statement
 - examining its operations
 - Improve the impact factor of the *Review*
 - See suggestions by librarians in Appendix F for ensuring the *Review* is properly indexed by the various search engines, from Google to the Web of Science
 - Identify sufficient funds to pay a graduate student to build an annotated bibliography of articles to allow future authors to link their work to previous work in the *Review*
 - The Association should widely disseminate this report – to peer associations, interested organizations, and department heads for example – to signal its desire to assist the *Review*

The Committee encountered a range of useful suggestions as to the future development of the *Review* such as

- The value of a distributed cost model that might call upon the resources of a range of university and other institutions for and support of components of the *Review's* mission (for example editing, web, book reviews)
- Opportunities to liaise with respective Deans to

- find opportunities to share costs across institutions
- seek various releases (administration, teaching) that would encourage membership of the Editorial Board, particularly the onerous Editor and related positions
- Consider sponsorship from suitable organizations with coincident interests
- Consider appropriate commercialization of some aspects of the *Review*, such as the website
- The value of improved links to regional Associations through
 - annual report on submissions presented at each regional conference
 - sponsoring panels at the regional association conferences
 - the inclusion of proceedings from the regional association conferences
 - edited in some form
 - publication of (or precis of) winning student papers in PPSA and other regional associations; publication of list of winners
 - recording/broadcasting of conference panels sponsored by the *Review*
- Continue and expand regular updates of provincial politics, including the current provincial election update section
- Explore the value of content linkages/interaction with other similar publications
- Make use of special issues highlighting under-published areas of the discipline
- Explicitly and consistently including teaching and learning, including exploring a connection to the 3M scholars project
- Explore making use of the other resources
 - <http://journals.uregina.ca/prairieforum>
 - <http://canadianelectionsdatabase.ca>
 - BC Studies, Prairie Forum and Acadiensis
 - other?
- Consider new approaches to publishing
 - an 'at issue' section making use of various formats
 - interviews with or conversations between senior scholars
 - central academic piece with accompanying commentaries
 - as special role – perhaps through reviews or interviews – for graduate students
 - sharing of some functions with *CJPS*, such as book reviews
 - opportunities for publishing the work of journalists and those involved in political and policy questions of the day
- Take advantage of diverse forms of publishing, communication, and emerging technologies that set it apart from other outlets
 - use of social media to engage academic and non-academic communities
 - enhanced website
 - capacity to publish quickly on topical issues
- The appeal of a connection to a publishing house and whether there is a 'beginners' package available for new journals

Appendix A: The Canadian Political Science Review

According to its website (<https://ojs.unbc.ca/index.php/cpsr/about>):

Focus and Scope

The Canadian Political Science Review is an electronic review of political science research undertaken by Canadians or about Canada. It invites manuscripts that address any issue of interest to political scientists and especially to its membership in the British Columbia and Prairie Provinces' Political Studies Associations and the Atlantic Provinces Political Science Association. The CPSR aims to stimulate the further intellectual development of political science within the Canadian political science community and in the international community of scholars in the field.

Peer Review:

The CPSR is a double-blind peer-reviewed journal. Anonymized manuscripts are circulated to reviewers for comment and anonymized comments from reviewers are circulated to authors to guide revisions, prior to acceptance of any manuscript for the Journal.

Focus and Scope

The Canadian Political Science Review is an electronic review of political science research undertaken by Canadians or about Canada. It invites manuscripts that address any issue of interest to political scientists and especially to its membership in the British Columbia and Prairie Provinces' Political Studies Associations and the Atlantic Provinces Political Science Association. The CPSR aims to stimulate the further intellectual development of political science within the Canadian political science community and in the international community of scholars in the field.

Peer Review Process

The CPSR is a double-blind peer-reviewed journal. Anonymized manuscripts are circulated to reviewers for comment and anonymized comments from reviewers are circulated to authors to guide revisions, prior to acceptance of any manuscript for the Journal.

Publication Frequency

The CPSR publishes two regular issues per year open from January to June and July to December. Articles appear electronically on an incremental basis once the review and copyediting processes have been completed. Special Issues are also published from time to time.

Open Access Policy

This journal provides immediate open access to its content on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge.

Archiving

This journal utilizes the LOCKSS system to create a distributed archiving system among participating libraries and permits those libraries to create permanent archives of the journal for purposes of preservation and restoration.

Editorial Team

Co-Editors

Tracy Summerville Department of Political Science, University of Northern BC

John Young, Department of Political Science University of Northern BC

Alan Siaroff, Department of Political Science, University of Lethbridge

Editorial Board (please consult the website)

Appendix B: A Brief History of the Canadian Political Science Review via Mike Howlett

The journal was founded after I was CJPS Editor, around 2004-2006. I was talking to people in the BCPSA about how few submissions the CJPS received on provincial issues, while there were a lot of papers being presented at the BCPSA meetings on this and how it would be nice to have a journal that published on these subjects. These were people like Jeremy Rayner who was then at Malaspina (now Vancouver Island University), Alan Siaroff at UBC and Tracy Summerville at UNBC and others like Derek Cook at Kamloops/Cariboo/now Thompson River. Others like Richard Sigurdson who I think was then in New Brunswick, Dave Stewart who was then in Winnipeg, and Anthony Sayers, who all had BC connections and used to come to the BCPSA, were also involved.

We thought at the time that the BCPSA was not large enough to carry this out on its own and that it would be good to include the Atlantic PPSA so I contacted a few people there to see if they would be interested - like Don Dessurud and Joanna Everitt at UNB St John, Chris Dunn at Memorial, Jeff McLeod at Mt. St. Vincent and Marc Doucet at St. Mary's - and they all said it would be a useful thing to have a new journal in the area that specialized on these topics. When Jeremy and Alan and Dave and Richard moved to Regina and Lethbridge and Calgary and Winnipeg and the PPSA started up, it was included as the third leg – there was a discussion of this with Brenda O'Neill, Lisa Young, David Stewart, Anthony Sayers, Harold Jansen and Ken Rasmusen at the PPSA meeting in Lethbridge.

We were very happy with this setup as we felt it more or less completed the Canadian circuit, with the CJPS as the Canadian (read Ontario) journal, the RQSP/Politique et Societe as the Quebec journal and the CPSR as the maritime/Atlantic one, west, BC and northern one. We then took advantage of free server space Tracy arranged at UNBC and free journal software developed at SFU to launch the journal. As this was an all volunteer effort we decided to do this as an open access journal (which was an idea well ahead of its time!) and as I recall the total cost of starting it up was \$25 to register the web domain name. The idea was to rotate the editorship between the three associations, but this did not work out very well, and it might have been a better idea just to run a competition between them, as there was always more interest in this in BC and the Prairies than in the APPSA (which was supportive but had trouble finding people to staff up a journal).

I still think that the CPSR can play a significant role in the Canadian political science sphere as a journal specializing on sub-national and provincial politics and it has this domain all to itself really. There are more people than ever in these fields and with the BCPSA, PPSA and APPSA all active and holding annual meetings there should be lots of material for the journal (let alone have 13 jurisdictions to cover in terms of elections and party behaviour etc., etc.).

Eventually this could go the way of the US journals and CPSR could be a rival to CJPS (as AJPS is a former regional journal which is now a serious rival to APSR in the US). However, this would require a larger community of scholars in Canada or more interest from outside of Canada than I think there is at present. However, a strong OA competitor to CJPS might still get a lot of interest and if this was layered on top of the sub-national base could generate enough quality MS to keep going.

Appendix C: Current state of the CPSR via Tracy Summerville

Editorial Team:

Tracy notes: "I run the journal off the side of my desk. Gary Wilson helps me in making decisions about reviewers and final decisions about publication. I have been responsible for most of the rest including copy editing and publishing the issues. Alan Siaroff runs the provincial perspectives section, but I also copy edit those papers and prepare them for uploading with the regular issue."

Level of Activity

December 2017 issue has been completed.

Submissions

An unscientific check of the number of articles shows that the *Review* has received 86 submissions since 2014. That number includes ones that went through review and were declined, ones that are resubmit, ones that are revisions and ones that were accepted and published.

This is a rate of about 2 a month which seems about right to me (although they tend to come in spurts depending on the time of year). We also have the Provincial Perspectives section that Alan Siaroff champions - these articles are not peer reviewed. They cover provincial election results.

Time to Publication

The time from submission to publication varies widely (depending on my workload and capacity). I (Tracy) would say 6 to 18 months.

Financial and logistical support

I get about \$60 a year from EBSCO and this year I got about \$450 from Copyright Canada. I have had support from my department in the past for an Assistant and I am going to apply to UNBC in January for some funds to get a student assistant.

UNBC hosts the journal for free and keeps the software updated.

Goals

My short-term goal would be to have a few more editors who could take on one or two articles from beginning to end: put the article into review, get the reviews and communicate with the author(s), decide about publication, send it to me for copy editing. The software is easy to use so the learning curve is fairly simple.

My long-term goal would be to have a journal manager. This goal could be accomplished if we are successful with a SSHRC grant.

Our acting chief librarian is looking into indexing the journal for impact factors which might help us in securing some resources.

Appendix D: Strategic Environment Review, CPSR

Strengths

- Has established an editorial team and operating systems (see Appendix C for details)
- Has basic institutional support including a server and physical home
- Has published solid research for over a decade
- Has some goodwill and reach in the Canadian political science community
- Sits on a highly flexible, low cost platform.

Weaknesses

- It has an uneven history of production and perhaps quality (common to many young journals)
- Its current level of institutional support is insufficient to sustain a quality journal
- Are submissions adequate to sustain a quality journal (see Appendix C)?
- It has, anecdotally, a limited reach within Canadian academe and faces even greater challenges becoming known beyond Canada (for example, those interested in the study of states/provinces/Cantons/Lander)
- It does not benefit from the resources of an established publishing house
- It is not currently formally linked to a set of institutions that might provide both financial support and a conduit to publishable research (for example, as the CPSA is to the CJPS). It is common for such journals to receive \$20-30,000 annually in subventions from a supporting association.

Opportunities

- Electronic publishing may well be the future for academic research and can, for example, be speedy
- While e-publishing is not cost free, scaling opportunities are very much greater than in traditional publishing. This includes other forms and sources of
 - Research
 - Data
 - New forms of academic output
- Upscaling comes with additional editorial costs and would require access to reliable financial and editorial resources
- There is a gap in the study of provincial politics and public policy
- There may be as yet untapped research fields for which it could provide an outlet.

Threats

- A low impact factor limits the Journals appeal, particularly for junior faculty seeking tenure and promotion
- A lack of financial support and personnel leave it vulnerable and limit its capacity to advertise its existence and build a consistent audience
- The proliferation of academic journals – with the gap between print and electronic all but disappearing – makes for a complicated and tough marketplace

Implications for the PPSA

- A formal tie-up or financial relationship between the *Review* and the *Association* implies some responsibility for how the *Review* is administered if only to oversee the monies directed to the *Review*
- A formal relationship with the *Review* would bring additional public realm demands on the *Association* (experienced by all associations in this position) such as bearing some responsibility for what is published in the *Review*
- The *Association* does not have any standing administrative capacity, so regular oversight of any relationship with the *Review* would be impossible with current structures
- Agreeing to any administrative oversight would bring costs for the *Association*
- Any financial contribution to the *Review* – direct or indirect- would be a substantial challenge for the *Association*, which is basically run on a cost-recovery model
- Additional direct or indirect costs to the *Association* can at present only be met by imputing them to the *Association's* one fundraising activity, the annual conference, thus raising the price.
- The *Association* may benefit from having a connection to a journal, including being able to more easily publish proceedings and inform others of its own activities.

Summary

There is little doubt that the *Review* is in a difficult situation. The financial, personnel, and logistical demands of sustaining the *Review* are barely being met. The publishing format allows this model to be sustainable, but it rests on a knife-edge defined by the willingness of the editorial team to operate the journal in addition to their regular duties.

Appendix E: Initial Proposals to Assist the CPSR

Each of the challenges facing the *Review* has solutions, although they come with costs. The committee notes articles in the 50th anniversary volume of the *Canadian Journal of Political Science (CJPS 50:1)* by Graham White and Alex Marland.¹ These provide excellent background information and in the Marland case, a substantial number of interesting options for journals dealing with the challenges of publishing in a changing environment. A central implied or explicit observation echoes Carty's 1997 point that the two factors a journal has control of that might shape appeal to academics are

1. Time to publication (as short a possible), and
2. Persistent and effective promotion of published articles (using social media etc.) to increase visibility and impact factor.

Here is an initial list of the movable parts with respect to the *Review*:

1. Shorten the time to publication:
 - Formally sharing the editorial work around a few people and places
 - Having a set team of reviewers who agree to a certain number of review each per year in their field
 - Having someone dedicated to the uploading and management of articles
2. Dissemination/Impact factor:
 - Having a group of (perhaps including grad students) willing to develop and use social media and other outlets to promote papers
 - Developing some expertise in loading non-traditional material to the website
 - Develop an annotated bibliography of all pieces published in the CPSR that is disseminated to authors to encourage them to cite previous CPSR articles in their own work
 - Building a more engaging website with embedded Twitter, Facebook, Instagram. RSS etc. feeds.
 - Other suggestions from Marland (*CJPS 50*) to heighten the appeal of the *Review*.
3. Administrative
 - Renew the editorial team
 - Pursue legal recognition of the formal, corporate structure of the *Review*
 - Sharing any financial costs and editorial work across several universities
 - Greater involvement of graduate students
 - Greater involvement of non-academics and non-academic organizations
4. Mission of the *Review*
 - Altering the remit of the *Review* to add more or different content and link to other sources of articles or relevant publishable material.

¹ It is worth noting that Table 1 of White's article shows that the contribution of central Canadian academics to the *Journal* has tracked generally upwards from 66% in the 1970s to 77% in the last decade, well above population proportions.

With these in mind, here are three initial suggestions to prompt our thinking:

The Full Model

The most demanding model is pursuing the full traditional journal route – such as involving a publishing house – comes at a cost of up to \$30,000 per annum. Guaranteeing timely editorial effort accounts for most of the costs associated with a connection to a publishing house: they require all correspondence, editing, book review management and so forth to be completing by the journal within the timeframe dictated by the publication cycle (or near to).

Logistical and personnel costs account for the \$20-30,000 price tag of such an arrangement. It is not clear how connection to a publishing house would shape the dynamics of on-line publishing, such as slowing down the process (that is, shaping those features of the *Review* that might be strengths under the current arrangement), although it is possible to imagine a two-part strategy, with some things tracking to the online journal only (and quickly) while others travel a more traditional route.

This approach is well beyond the means of the PPSA as currently structure and financed. Even some consortium of the PPSA, BCPSA, and APPSA is unlikely to be able to afford the full model. However, this might work by, for example, developing a group who would work with the current editorial team on a SSHRC application. (As noted below, Tracy S sees the SSHRC route as a possible path forward). Engaging the Canadian Political Science association is likely the only means of achieving such a result in the short run.

The Partial Model 1

A less demanding approach is to consider modifications to the operation of the *Review* that might help it stabilize in the short run and prosper in the mid-term. This might mean helping to pay for the work of an editor, without providing any detailed suggestions as to how the journal might be reworked. However, even buying a single editor out of one course for a year comes with at a cost of \$7-10,000. Even this is beyond the capacity of the PPSA to finance, and likely beyond that of the three regional associations. Universities or other organizations may have to be involved. Whether this model might still meet the requirements to allow a formal tie-up with a publishing house is an open question.

The Partial Model 2

An even less financially onerous approach would be to offer little or no financial support to the *Review*, but rather draw on the insights offered by the articles in the *CJPS* noted above to modify its operation in the hopes of stabilizing its administrative structures and increasing its appeal. Sharing administrative, editorial and dissemination tasks on a volunteer basis across many organizations.

Appendix F: Comments on Discussion Paper and Draft Proposals, Assisting the CPSR

Graham White, JP Lewis, Alex Netherton, Mike Howlett; Ken Carty; Dr. Muiris MacCarthaigh, President, Political Studies Association of Ireland; Huw Price, Managing Editor, Politics Journals Routledge, Taylor and Francis; Christie Hurrell, Digital Initiatives and Scholarly Communication Librarian, University of Calgary; John Wright, Liaison Librarian Political Science, University of Calgary;

Graham White, former English editor, CJPS:

Thanks for involving me in this. I have a variety of reactions to the Discussion Paper and the Draft Proposal. They are all underpinned by a desire to see the *Review* prosper and expand and admiration for all of those who have toiled and continue to toil so thanklessly to keep it afloat.

What follows is a brief rendering of my thoughts; if any seem worth expanding upon, let me know, though I won't be able to respond right away since I'm in Labrador all next week.

I have a number of comments on specific proposals but first three basic – and interrelated – principles:

- 1) It's neither promising for the long term nor fair to those working on the *Review* to have to produce it on the cheap. That's not a pejorative observation but a recognition that to do it properly will cost a bit (recognizing that on-line publication can help a good deal in keeping costs down).
- 2) The regional associations simply don't have the financial resources the *Review* needs.
- 3) CPSA has the mission and the responsibility to foster Canadian Political Science in its multiple forms. And while CPSA has its own financial concerns, it does have substantial resources. Bottom line: I can't see a secure, long-term quality future for the *Review* without significant CPSA involvement.

In terms of specific points in the detailed proposals:

reinvigorating the Editorial Board and involving them significantly in the operation of the *Review* is a good idea but will take a lot of work to realize – identifying the right people and ensuring that they actually do contribute. On a personal note, my principal regret from my time as *CJPS* editor was our failure to make use of the talent and experience of the Editorial Board; mostly this was a function of lack of time.

- special issues offer good possibilities for producing good work that will attract attention; they, do however, entail a fair bit of work.
- there is, in my view, huge scope to do good and important things on the teaching/learning front; *CJPS* does virtually nothing along those lines.
- all of the suggestions in #4 are good ones, but to be done right will take a lot of time and energy. Social media, networking, etc: of course, but recognize that everyone else in the world is trying to do this.

- there is much to be said for linking up with a publishing house, but what would be in it for them? Even non-profit/university-based concerns need to see some monetary returns.
- I'm leery of the suggestions in #1 of the Solutions in the Discussion Paper. Even within Cdn politics, there are specialities that call for expertise beyond what a set team of reviewers could offer; otherwise put, the *Review* will always need to call on a wide range of reviewers. More significantly, I'm dubious about sharing editorial work beyond two or three people – ensuring consistent standards and processes and managing the team could prove problematic and/or onerous.

Returning to what seems to me the essential issue, I think CPSA just has to be engaged. They may be reluctant to take on a major commitment or they may welcome it but they are not the enemy (nor by extension, is *CJPS*). Do recognize though that involving CPSA necessarily raises issues relating to submissions and publications in French.

JP Lewis, Atlantic Provinces Political Studies Association

As they are currently formalizing their governance structures, the APPSA is unable to provide an authoritative answer to the questions raised in the proposal and transmitted to JP Lewis, the ex officio member of the committee from APPSA and Past President.

However, in principle, JP sees advantages to greater linkages through the conference and Board of the CPSR. A final decision will have to wait until the October 2018 APPSA meeting.

JP noted that from his conversations, he would say that APPSA does have an interest in the journal, but their human and financial resources are limited. Their process of constitutional (due to be completed late 2019) will give a better idea of what resources to tangibly support the journal are available.

While there are a couple of Atlantic Canadian political science departments that may be large enough to host the journal, as you know many of the departments are quite small (UNBSJ for example has four political scientists).

I've heard from some APPSA members that there is a concern with fixing up the CPSR website as the aesthetic and user experience may be turning off both readers and contributors.

Alex Netherton, British Columbia Political Studies Association

Thanks for sending the discussion document and draft proposals for review. I will comment on your draft proposals in each of the five interrelated categories. But the comments can be preceded by the acknowledgement that many of the proposals ask directly or indirectly for regional associations and member institutions to play a greater role in supporting and sustaining the journal. Accordingly, it makes sense from the BCPSA perspective, to highlight the importance of representation from regional associations on the board, small changes in regional conference organization that could support the review, as well as incremental steps to share the responsibility for support activities. All this to say that we think the CPSR is an important institution and can be placed on a sustainable footing with the

implementation of substantial incremental steps. The idea of substantial financial funding from regional organizations is not a viable option, and substantial 'external' funding and support an unlikely short-term possibility.

1. Map the communities of interest: Comment

These are a good set of recommendations in that they are, for the most part, not hard for regional organizations and others to implement.

To a certain extent this is not constituency mapping, it is constituency reinforcement and building. From the BCPSA perspective it is evident that ties are weak between the annual general meeting and the CPSR. We can take steps to encourage paper submissions and the like. This promotion is virtually costless and easy to do. But it has its limits.

I also like the idea of reports on submissions to let regional organizations concretely define the publishing relationship between the association conferences and the journal. It has been my experience in the past that publisher reps may email or write after a paper presentation to signal interest in having the paper submitted to their journal. I think that it would be a good idea for the CPSR reps to attend regional meetings or find someone to represent them to do the same thing.

I also like the idea of having some data on turnaround time for submissions as it gives authors some plausible ideas of publishing possibilities.

One set of data missing in the discussion paper was the existing identity (as in institutional or career, profile) of those that have submitted and published in the journal, so I cannot define the present community.

One of the implications of this for the BCPSA and other regional organizations is that publishing proceedings or seeking finished final papers would provide the journal with the appropriate level of raw material for the submission stage.

You will not be surprised when we agree that representatives of regional associations should be on the board. The CPSR was born out of regional associations, and this representation is important to ensure a commitment and buy in from regional associations to the review.

When the proposal document talks about finding provincial organizations to help promote the journal, it might be better to look at universities to actively promote the journal would be much more effective. (Who reads a government website for journal scanning?) Governments may be more valuable on the financial side.

2. Reinvigorating the Editorial Board: Comment

These are key recommendations for the implementation of your recommendations. Most boards have members who specialize in fund raising and it seems to me that the CPSR has already begun to think about distributing workloads. The last two recommendations on distributed and shared costs are very important and should be key to placing the journal on a more balanced sustainable path.

Here I also think that having representatives from the three regional associations on the board will be of great value. They simply have much more at stake regarding the success of the journal than non-associated board members, and therefore will add a different dimension to board thinking. Additionally, I am informed that the original idea for the CPSR was to have each of the three regional associations

manage it for a two-year period. But this has not really worked out in practice. The success of the journal will have to rely upon drawing on the diverse strengths of each of the associations.

Before the CPSR each of the three regional organizations published their proceedings. The CPSR was then thought to be a vehicle to accomplish these tasks. But this has not occurred, and indeed, the CPSR no longer has direct ties or even close working ties to the BCPSA. Placing representatives of regional associations on the board will be one way to begin re-establishing these ties.

3. Revisiting the Review's Mandate: Comment

Again, these are all great recommendations. And my only concern, mentioned above, is that it is difficult for me to define what the working or practiced mandate of the CPSR, in contrast to what people think it is or should be. The CPSR website gives very few mandate signals.

Without a working mandate statement from the CPSR it is difficult for me to comment on the definition or expansion of its disciplinary mandate.

Your discussion paper clearly points out that the CPSR does not have the resources to be an alternative general journal to the CJPS. It needs a mandate and identity of its own. Here there is a lot to be learned from existing regional multidisciplinary journals, such as *BC Studies*, *Prairie Forum* and *Acadiensis*. Each as a strong continuous identity and publishing track record.

What would be the expressed mandate / identity of the CPSR?

- Provincial, intergovernmental and multilevel governance politics and political economy
- Federalism and regionalism.
- Urban and regional politics,
- Indigenous politics and governance.
- Public policy (a myriad) and administration central to provinces
- Added: Your idea that special issues can probe and define boundaries.
- Added: Research on teaching and learning would be critically important.
- Missing: No mention of theory or ideas.
- Missing: No mention of critical reviews (articles that review genres or groupings of research or literature to generalize about the state of knowledge or published research in any area. If the CPSR was a centre of publishing on provincial politics, then this would be a logical extension.

These listings do not mean that the CPSR should never publish other items. Rather it just means that this would be its core mandate. Again, the idea is for the journal to work towards establishing its identity. Items to attract graduate students are mentioned here, this warrants greater emphasis and elaboration.

Parenthetically, in thinking about this issue it also struck me that the BCPSA must do the same thing; reinforce its core identity. Here one can help the other.

I encourage the journal to continue with its provincial perspectives section—though I am not sure about its lack of peer review.

4. Diverse forms of Publishing, Communication, and Emerging Technologies: Comment

Again, these are all good suggestions, and I strongly suggest that some of these steps be taken immediately. Again, when I compare the journal sites of *BC Studies*, *Prairie Forum* and *Acadiensis* with

the CPSR it is patently obvious that the CPSR site does not attempt to build an identity or attract constituencies. It is simply a non-descript administrative porthole. .

All these suggestions are great; interviews, special panels, social media promotion and the like. And there are more. The CPSA, for example, has that three-minute thesis presentation competition. Could one of the regional associations do something similar that is posted on the CPSR website?

But the burden for change will fall not simply on the journal. The BCPSA and the APPSA each have rotating conferences, meaning that gaining resources for digitalization of panels, interviews and the like, will be marked by uneven growth. The PPSA, on the other hand, has a permanent location with all needed resources at hand. All these suggestions come at a price. Conference organizers will have to build these costs into operating budgets.

Lastly, one caveat learned from experience. The more complex a website becomes; the more energy and resource must be dedicated to its maintenance. Enhancing the website may depend upon going further on cost distribution and sharing.

5. Identify Individuals Willing to Participate in Fundraising Exercises

I will canvas the BCPSA executive to take stock of individuals at the next AGM.

The immediate priority is the SSRHC grant applications for a journal manager (if I understand correctly). This is followed by organizational sponsorships, support (purchase of a software package from established publishing house and support from regional organizations for an indexing project). These are all important and they will take time to accomplish or implement. At the same time, I wonder why some important short-term items, like the indexing project or some of the web development identified above, cannot be carried out by graduate students under the terms of university administered federal jobs money. Again, incremental substantial steps.

Summary

Again, thanks for including us in the review and in for the work and thought that has gone into the discussion document and proposals. Certainly, a significant and continuous external source of revenue would be ideal for the CPSR. But the likelihood of this to occur in the short term is not high. Regional Associations do not have deep enough pockets. And there is no clear reason behind the CPSA taking on that role. So, in the meantime.... your document outlines a series of incremental changes that will make a real difference for the sustainability of the review and its contributions to the research and publication in core areas. The CPSR should take steps to clearly (re) define its mandate and identity. It would be great to reinvigorate the board. Regional Association representation on a reinvigorated board could be a step in this direction and implementation of key reforms. Moves to more effectively use information and communication technologies conditioned by the financial limitations of the review and regional associations. And the CPSR could benefit from fundraising services. There are many small journals that thrive under similar limitations by identifying their niche, and a reformed CPSR will have good company.

Mike Howlett, former Editor CPSR and English Editor CJPS (via email):

I'm very glad to see these proposals for revitalizing the Journal. In an odd way CPSR is ahead of the curve in being full OA and if this can be maintained, should work well (vs paying out \$30K to a publisher for

nothing, really). If you want a bit of \$\$ from this, you could always institute page charged for accepted MS or a small APC for submissions (\$50?). But the SSHRC grant would be the way to go, for sure (but does this programme still exist? I recall seeing something for JCPA a few months ago saying it had been frozen while it was being reviewed). Since the Journal now has about a decade of publishing under its belt it definitely would qualify under the old rules, and SSHRC claims it is very supportive of Open Access.

In any event, Option 1 (a course buy-out for the editor would be great). When CJPA was at SFU we received 3-course buy-outs per year for the Editorial team (me, Linda and Laurent) plus money to hire 2 editorial assistants fulltime (Russ Williams and Andrea Migone). The full package was worth something like \$30K per year for three (extended to 4) years. Arranging something like that for a rotating CPSR Editorial team shouldn't be too hard to arrange.

Good luck with it!

Ken Carty, Editor, Irish Political Studies:

Academic publishing continues to go through a relatively unpredictable internet-driven revolution. At the same time, changing technology offers new opportunities regarding the sorts of research that is possible, how it is distributed, and the form in which it is presented to audiences.

It is feasible to publish the work of a wide set of actors – academics, journalists, policy makers and politicians – in a way that creates engagement with important issues. The immediacy of the electronic form plus the capacity for commentary and updating may be attractive to potential audiences. Elections, policy debates, academic theoretical disagreements, political crises as well as changes in the teaching and university environment provide opportunities along these lines. Commissioning work on topical issues – say from journalists – might be a way of achieving this engagement.

It is now possible to embed images, graphs, sound bytes, movies, and other forms of information in ways that are both minimally disruptive to the text, relatively cost-effective, and allow the presentation of information previously unavailable to journals. Articles may be updated with correction, additions, and responses to critiques. This presents a new frontier that may help a journal gain profile in the discipline and perhaps more widely. I suggest you contact Dr. Muiris MacCarthaigh, president of the Political Studies Association of Ireland who may have more information about the relationship between academic associations, journals and publishing houses (Sayers – I have done this).

I hope you find these suggestions useful. Good luck with your work.

Dr. Muiris MacCarthaigh, President, Political Studies Association of Ireland (via email and skype):

An email exchange and conversation with Muiris were extremely productive. Muiris believes that a publishing house would welcome a relationship to the *Review*, and that a tie-up could be financially advantageous to the Association.

The relationship between the Association (PSAI; <http://www.psaie.ie/>), its *Journal, Irish Political Studies* (<http://www.psaie.ie/journal/>), and the publisher of the *Journal*, Taylor and Francis (T&F; <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/fips20/current>) holds many potential lessons for the PPSA.

- Taylor and Francis manages membership in the Association (Association membership stands at about 170). The mailing list of the Association is broader and involves politicians, journalists etc.
- &F keeps part of the membership fee as a *Journal* fee then passes on the rest
- The *Journal* produces two regular issues, 1 special issue and a 'data' issue each year
- The sale of the *Journal* and its articles generates sizeable income for the Association that is passed to it from T &F.
- A disproportionate contribution to these monies results from the "Peter Mair Memorial Lecture" each year that is given by a prominent speaker and published in the *Journal*
- T&F bundles the *Journal* with others and is usually in search of more content. It provides word limits for each issue and handles advertising and relations with consumers.
- Muiris looked at our site and noted that the quality of the existing articles is strong. There is value in these existing articles for T&F as, if they brought them in-house, they would make money from being able to 'rent' them across the internet.
- T&F may well find the CPSR attractive for its past and possible future production.
- Membership of the editorial board tends to have inertia; change is not regular.
- Muiris provided broad details about the financial relationship between the Association and T&F and is happy to have future discussions.
- Muiris provided contact details for Huw Price who manages the Association's dealings with T&F and through whom we might discuss options for the CPSR.

Email exchange, Huw Price, Managing Editor, Politics Journals Routledge, Taylor and Francis

The economics of publishing a journal through an established publisher, particularly a journal that has not generated an economic return in the past, are challenging. In brief, the per article cost to R, T & F is between US\$600-\$1000. For two or three issues of the *CPSR* a year ranging around 15 articles, we would be looking at needing to raise say \$15,000 Canadian. That said, publishers offset these costs through subscriptions and article download charges, which are dependent on the success of the *Journal*. Success would likely reduce the cost of publishing the journal. However, given its open access structure to this point, we have little sense of the appeal of the *CPSR* and whether it is likely to generate any such income.

Subvention from the PPSA, and if they were inclined, the other regional associations (APPSA and BCPSA), would at best cover only a fraction of this cost. The CPSA might be a source of funding. Other monies might come from a per article charge to authors – something that would be unlikely to attract much interest given current opportunities to publish without such a charge. Alternatively, as noted by the current editor Tracy Summerville, Huw Price suggested seeking SSHRC aid to scholarly publication support and keeping the journal in its current open access format (something SSHRC favours).

This approach would do nothing to address the need for support required by the editorial team in the short run, and such support would depend in the mid-term on the *CPSR* generating sufficient appeal as a published house journal to support subscriptions and downloads. Until and unless this happened, external support would be required.

**Email exchange, Christie Hurrell, Digital Initiatives and Scholarly Communication Librarian
University of Calgary**

Increasing the impact of your journal takes time and effort, and the method that will work most effectively will depend on your community and their habits as readers and authors.

For example, if you know that people in your community are active on social media (e.g. academic twitter) it may be worthwhile to pour some energy into a communications plan around promoting your content that way. The journal could have its own accounts and promote new content, and you could encourage authors/editors to do the same.

Although OJS journals are well-indexed by Google Scholar, getting them indexed by databases most commonly used by your academic community can also increase their “findability” and therefore impact.

Another tactic that is often impactful is putting together special issues: these tend to attract more concentrated traffic and in turn may increase citations. If you are working with a guest editor, I would recommend choosing carefully (or maintaining some control among your regular editorial team) to ensure that the author experience remains consistently positive – sometimes guest editors can contribute to longer turnaround times or lower responsiveness, and this can be negative for authors.

A baseline – yet important - thing is to ensure that publishing with your journal is an enjoyable experience for current authors, so that they want to come back and so they recommend the journal as a venue to colleagues: simple submission process, reasonable turnaround times for peer review, respectful interactions with editors, etc.

If you have a conference associated with your journal, approaching people to submit content to the journal can be a good way to attract influential folks in your discipline.

Indexing the journal is important. The process for getting indexed in Web of Science (or, more usually, Emerging Sources Citation Index) is outlined here: <https://clarivate.com/essays/journal-selection-process/>. The journal is listed in Ebsco, but worth checking whether it is captured by such indexes as the international-political science abstracts: <https://www.ebsco.com/products/research-databases/international-political-science-abstracts>.

Email exchange, John Wright, Liaison Librarian Political Science, University of Calgary

it is probably worthwhile reviewing a couple of the commercial vendor websites that do have assistance for journal editor sections, that can have useful blogs and techniques; for example:

<https://editorresources.taylorandfrancisgroup.com/category/raising-the-profile/>

<https://editorresources.taylorandfrancisgroup.com/category/managing-my-journal/>

<https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/promote-your-journal>

https://academic.oup.com/journals/pages/authors/Promoting_your_article

Although some of these articles are very specific to the commercial publishers involved, they are useful peeks at how one needs to think about how journals are promoted and discovered. Especially on working with authors to be their own salespeople (something I used to work a lot on with authors when I was at the UofC Press). This can range from active promotion to better metadata for passive discovery, such as having really good abstracts.

It is also worth doing some searching of our library resources on political science journal impact factors, journal ranking, promoting scholarly publications, marketing academic publications, etc. (and again, Christine will I hope be helpful regarding additional specific target sources and search terminology). A quick and dirty search was able to pull out a few examples:

Marland, A. (2017). Journal publishing and marketing in an age of digital media, open access and impact factors. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 50(1), 77-95. doi: <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/10.1017/S0008423916001086>

Editorial: Politics in 2013 – The Changing Landscape of Academic Publishing, *Politics*, Vol 33, Issue 1, pp. 1 – 4 <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/10.1111/1467-9256.12000>

Jose Luis Ortega, (2017) "The presence of academic journals on Twitter and its relationship with dissemination (tweets) and research impact (citations)", *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 69 Issue: 6, pp.674-687, <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-02-2017-0055>