

GYA Outputs Review Committee (ORC)

(Anna-Maria, 18 Nov 2021; revised by Jim Curtiss November 2023)

Committee co-leads	Sandeep Kaur (Teresa de la Puente [nee Stoepler] helped transition to new co-lead, then stepped down in Sept. 2021)
EC ex-officio contact name 2023/24	Andreea Molnar; Devina Lobine
Office contact name	James (Jim) Curtiss
Committee mailing list	Revcom@globalyoung.academy
Who can join?	GYA members & alumni (In exceptional cases, one of the co-leads can be a GYA alumnus/a.) In addition to the core group of committee members, the entire GYA membership and alumni constitute the potential pool of reviewers for specific topics/disciplines, based on their expertise and previous GYA engagement (e.g. in working groups). The Committee co-leads/lead will approach suitable candidates for each upcoming review individually and ask for their time and contribution.
When?	Call annually after AGM + members can join any time
	Names of members of the committee are not publicised

Independence of the ORC

Given the potential significance of the outputs to the reputation of the GYA, the ORC sits as a completely independent committee. It is not under the jurisdiction of the EC or any of its portfolios. This ensures sufficient arms' length distance to make impartial decisions. ORC members must declare all conflicts of interest and, if required, recuse themselves from a decision-making process.

Leadership

The RC has two co-leads; one of the co-leads must be a continuing ORC member to ensure the transfer of institutional knowledge and the appropriate shepherding of projects under review at the time of the AGM when members normally leave or join. The co-leads work together closely to ensure that the processes and procedures are followed properly and that an annual report may be created for the information of the GYA membership and alumni at each AGM.

Terms of reference & GYA-internal review process for GYA Statements, papers, surveys, ...

The GYA Outputs Review Committee (ORC) manages the review of all GYA outputs that are intended for release into the public domain in the name of the GYA, or are recognised as having had major GYA input and/or funding (GYA Statements, reports, surveys, etc.).

Similar to an editorial board, members of the committee will not necessarily carry out the review themselves, but it is up to them to find suitable reviewers among the GYA members and alumni (sometimes also external experts, or GYA Advisory Board members), collect their feedback and communicate this feedback back to the group whose output is being reviewed.

In addition to current GYA members, GYA alumni should also be approached as reviewers (provided there are no conflicts of interest), to make use of their experience for the good of the GYA.

Reviews happen on a rolling basis, whenever a group submits an output for review. Groups are asked to notify the ORC lead/co-leads (and the Office) as soon as possible about outputs requiring review.

If they know that this final draft is coming, the Outputs Review Committee can already have lined up possible reviewers, expediting this part of the process. The purpose of the GYA-internal review is to have a critical friend who knows the GYA and our mission and vision look over the planned publication and highlight with constructive criticism ways in which the planned publication can become stronger.

Once the document(s) have been submitted for review, reviewers will read through the work (1 month max) and provide feedback to the submitting group so that comments/questions may be dealt with before the output is sent to external reviewers and so that momentum may be sustained.

For large GYA publications (e.g. report on biodiversity including recommendations) 1-2 external reviewers will then be asked for comment (1 month max). External reviewers can be from the GYA Advisory Board, or from field/discipline-specific partner organisations. In the interest of saving them time, they could be asked to focus on a publication's introduction, Executive Summary, and any recommendations included.

In the case of GYA Statements and Reports, your text then goes to external review, e.g. scientific review by external experts from the field, science policy-relevant review by someone from the GYA Advisory Board or science advice practitioner. Again, knowing when to expect this final version helps the Outputs Review Committee to have external reviewers ready and to make the process as fast as possible.

If there are any major issues, the submitting group will address them and a final decision (based on whether or not the requested changes/updates/corrections have been sufficiently addressed) will be given by the ORC.

Your group then has time to work with their feedback before handing over the final text/product to the Office for publication support and the EC (for information).

The results of any review process are put forward to the entire EC (including GYA Co-Chairs and Working Group Portfolio co-leads) for formal approval. In case of problematic cases/contested issues, the EC makes the final decision.

Members of a group submitting an output for review will not be asked to act as reviewers even if they had no part in developing the output in question, to avoid conflicts of interest.

Reviews needed in a very short period of time in the interest of the GYA's standing vis-à-vis its partners (less than 10 days), or any ad-hoc statements of a political/current-affairs nature issued on behalf of the GYA, will go directly to the EC.

The committee lead/co-leads act(s) as the editor to preliminarily review the document, identify appropriate reviewers and collect their feedback and communicate this feedback back to the authors and the GYA Office staff liaison.

Surveys

Experience shows that creating and conducting a proper survey, based on sound scientific methodology, can be daunting. If your group plans to run a survey, please contact James, who will help put you in touch with other groups who have survey experience.

All surveys that go out via the GYA need to go through internal GYA review.

To protect the reputation of the GYA as well as to avoid losing members' time and energy on developing work on the basis of problematic surveys, the EC suggests the following measures:

A survey is already a GYA "product". We suggest that surveys need to go through the Review Committee (or specialized subset of it, that *must* contain a social scientist) before being sent out. This would hold for internal as well as external surveys if they are created towards a product (report, opinion piece, video) that is disseminated in the name of the GYA. Together with a survey, a short description of how the survey will be used and specification on how they plan to analyze the data should also be provided.

If the Outputs Review Committee only intervenes after the report has been written, and the work was based on a faulty survey, all the work has been for nothing, and the report cannot be published. This extra review of surveys is not a bureaucratic measure but it is really to help our members to produce quality results.

External, peer-reviewed publications

Works already submitted to an outside peer-reviewed publication, such as a book, journal article, or scientific report do not need to go through external review again. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE WILL ONLY NEED TO SEE PROOF OF PEER REVIEW AND FINAL ACCEPTANCE.

In cooperation with the GYA Office liaison, formatting issues such as how the GYA corporate style is represented, whether affiliations are included, etc., will be addressed prior to GYA approval.

Please inform the Office (Jim) and EC (via Jim and EC WG Portfolio lead) of planned publications; once the group has a paper, submit it to the journal in question. Once it has been accepted, the ORC only needs to see it very briefly to make sure it is not contrary to GYA interests, and then the EC is informed that this is going out. Then it goes out to the journal. Then the group works with the Office (Jim) to accompany the release in the journal with a news release and social media activities.

Papers in journals need to list GYA membership, and an acknowledgement, e.g. "This paper grew out of the Global Young Academy's "Science Advice" working group."

Moreover, GYA members involved should self-identify (in a footnote, authors note) as a GYA member in addition to their institutional affiliation as a scientist. If GYA working group funding was involved, the following phrase should be included in the publication: “Funding from the GYA working group X is gratefully acknowledged.”

In cases of large projects with significant BMBF funding, the BMBF as a funder of the GYA needs to be acknowledged. If in doubt, ask the Office:

Should later rounds of review from the journal result in any GYA-relevant changes to the text, please also let us know.

Later, of course, the Office will be happy to support you in disseminating the article, if it is published. Please let us know when this will happen, so that we can prepare. Thank you!

Review to decide on allocation of DOI

Quality considerations should guide which GYA reports and papers shall be published with a DOI and get included in the Leopoldina Digital Library. The ORC should decide which outputs warrant a DOI and inclusion in Leopoldina Digital Library. For this, the Office sends the publication to the ORC Co-Leads, who then engage 1-3 reviewers to decide on this matter.

If the publication in question goes through internal GYA review anyway, the question of DOI can be decided by the reviewers.

GYA uses Creative Commons licensing for its documents