



Purpose:

To update the Bulkley Valley Research Centre Publication and Report Policy.

Rationale:

The present Bulkley Valley Research Centre policy on reviewing reports and publications was developed with the goal of ensuring that our pursuit of excellence extends beyond the research itself to the written products of that research. However, it has not been consistently followed. Some board members feel that it is too onerous and does not reflect the reality of research funding and timelines. In addition, some types of publications are not covered in the present policy. Thus, the following draft revised policy has been developed for discussion within the Board.

Recommendation:

To accept the updated Reports and Publications Review Policy as provided on Oct. 19, 2009 and implement it in all future contracts.

Bulkley Valley Research Centre **Reports and Publications Review Policy**

Bulkley Valley Research Centre publications include all those reports on projects administered by the Centre, those reports and publications distributed on the Centre web site or in hard copy with the Centre logo, or submitted for publication elsewhere (including periodicals and scientific journals) in which the Centre is listed as the primary affiliation. Not all Member reports and publications must be treated as Bulkley Valley Research Centre publications, but such works cannot then identify the Centre as an affiliation of the author(s).

All Bulkley Valley Research Centre publications will include a notation on the cover page indicating whether they have undergone an independent peer review or not.

i.e. "This report has undergone an independent peer review."

or

"This report has not undergone an independent peer review"

Researchers will be made aware of the peer review requirements of their projects through the distribution of this policy during the development of the project proposal. It is important that the researcher discuss with the Centre the level and type of review that will be completed during the project proposal stage. Researchers need to be aware that potential reviewers are busy and it is important that the researcher allow sufficient time in the report preparation process for review. Funding for the reviewers is recommended to be incorporated into the project budget where required. The final review process that will be undertaken will be determined during the contract negotiation phase and included in the contract.

The following outlines the review requirements for selected report types:

1. Literature reviews and background papers:
 - Literature reviews, background papers, bibliographies and other reports that do not involve significant analysis or synthesis (for example re-measuring research plots without doing analysis) will be reviewed by the Research Manager or designate (RM/d) for completeness.
2. Progress reports and extension notes:
 - Progress and annual reports do not require a full peer review but will be reviewed by the RM/d to ensure that the contents are consistent with Bulkley Valley Research Centre objectives.
 - Extension notes that are based on research reports that have undergone a peer review need only to be reviewed by the RM/d; all other extension notes will be processed like major reports (see #4).
3. Conference and Workshop proceedings:
 - Conference proceedings that include submitted abstracts only or submitted abstracts with taped versions of the talks do not require a full peer review but abstracts should be reviewed by the RM/d and edited to ensure consistent formatting.
 - Conference proceedings that include full papers will undergo independent peer review as described for major reports below.

4. Major reports:

- If the final report or a substantial portion thereof is submitted to a journal with an independent peer-review process, then the evaluation process used by that journal will be sufficient.
- If the final report is submitted to a funding agency that includes an independent peer-review process, then the evaluation process used by the funding agency will be sufficient.
- If the final report is not intended to be submitted to such a journal, then the Bulkley Valley Research Centre will undertake a peer review for major reports as follows:
 - ❑ The RM/d will be identified as the lead editor in the review process and they will be responsible for ensuring the review process is completed in a timely manner;
 - ❑ The lead researcher will identify potential peer reviewers (three to four) with expertise in the field;
 - ❑ The RM/d will consider the proposed reviewers as well as other qualified reviewers and will select reviewer(s). Typically two reviewers will be selected;
 - ❑ The RM/d will ensure that the reviewer(s) will be able to conduct the review in a timely manner and will negotiate any compensation, based on available funds designated in the research project;
 - ❑ The reviewer(s) will submit their review to the RM/d, and will have the choice of remaining anonymous (blind) or of signing their comments;
 - ❑ The lead researcher will consider the review comments and either amend the report or submit a rationale to the RM/d why the comments were not incorporated;
 - ❑ The RM/d will decide if the final report has adequately addressed the comments, and is ready for publication by the Bulkley Valley Research Centre.
 - ❑ The Centre will undertake a grammatical edit and reports will be published using a standard report format.