

Our scientific boards

Purpose and role

Three scientific boards support OpenEdition in its work:

- OpenEdition Calenda's scientific board, which focuses on the Calenda platform;
- OpenEdition Hypotheses' scientific board, which focuses on the Hypotheses platform;
- OpenEdition's scientific board, which focuses mainly on the OpenEdition Books and OpenEdition Journals platforms, but also has a wider reach across all four platforms.

The main roles of the scientific boards are:

- to help develop open scholarly communication in the humanities and social sciences;
- to be part of the strategic development of OpenEdition platforms;
- to contribute to OpenEdition's scientific policy.

The members of the scientific boards play a key role in ensuring the infrastructure functions smoothly, by regularly attending meetings, appraising applications and casting their vote, among other things.

Appointment and renewal

The members of scientific boards are appointed for a three-year term, renewable once.

When a term comes to an end, a call for candidates is launched via several channels ([Calenda](#), the [Léo](#) blog on Hypotheses, social media) and relayed by members of the scientific board via their own communication networks.

Candidates are required to submit a CV and a cover letter to us.

Applications are appraised and discussed by the members of the scientific board concerned, with selection criteria designed to strike a good balance in terms of the disciplines, academic locations and positions represented.

We encourage applications from people working abroad, provided they understand French, which is the language used for work and discussion during meetings (English can also be used, but only for written communication).

We prefer it if some members of the outgoing scientific board stay on for a second term to make the transition smoother. In any case, members of a scientific board are not allowed to sit on the board for more than two terms.



OpenEdition's scientific board

OpenEdition's [scientific board](#) is made up of twenty or so members from a broad range of humanities and social science disciplines.

Its scope of action encompasses all the infrastructure's platforms (OpenEdition Books, OpenEdition Journals, Calenda and Hypotheses). However, Calenda and Hypotheses each have their own specific scientific board as well, which follows their development closely (see below).

One of the specific roles of OpenEdition's scientific board is to decide which journals and book collections will be added to our OpenEdition Journals and OpenEdition Books platforms.

OpenEdition Journals

The scientific board generally convenes quarterly (in March, June, October and December) to evaluate the admissibility of journals applying to join the OpenEdition Journals platform.

The members of the scientific board assess the relevance and originality of the publication's scientific project, its scientific scope, its editorial quality and, last but not least, the resources the journal has at its disposal to manage the entire editorial process. The board's assessment is partly based on at least two [external appraisals](#), submitted by researchers specializing in the disciplines and subject areas covered by the journal.

Admissibility meetings take place following an initial internal appraisal of applications by the OpenEdition Journals validation committee, which rates the editorial project and the technical feasibility of each application. The committee issues two ratings, one for the editorial aspect of the journal and the other for the organization of the project and its long-term viability. The ratings range from A to D (A = high priority; B = medium priority; C = deferred; D = rejected). The validation committee does not assess the scientific merit of the publication.

The Journals validation committee includes the manager of the Freemium Service for OpenEdition Journals, the manager of the Books and Journals Service, the deputy director of the Publishing Division, and the director of OpenEdition. It is chaired by the membership officers.

The OpenEdition membership team then forwards the journal applications to the scientific board for further appraisal. Each board member gives the journals a rating from A to D, as above, according to the same criteria. Ratings are attributed anonymously.

The board has the final say on whether to accept, defer or reject a journal. A letter is then sent to the journal's editorial team to inform them of the decision. If a journal's admissibility is deferred, the letter describes the improvements that need to be made before submitting the journal again within the time frame set out in the deferral letter.

The admissibility meetings enable the scientific board to discuss and deliberate over the applications.

They are also an opportunity for the board to define OpenEdition's scientific policy. In doing so, the board also helps establish the reference criteria for journals and publishers applying to join the platform. For example, to ensure the quality of the publications submitted, the scientific board requires publications to present their selection and evaluation procedures clearly, and the articles published need to be peer reviewed as a minimum requirement. Similarly, in a drive



to strengthen the diversity of its journals and collections, the scientific board prefers it when authors of a journal or book collection are not always the same, and come from a variety of institutions.

In 2015, the scientific board decided that a quota of 30 journals would be accepted annually to avoid over-stretching the capacity of our platform, and it also refined the admissibility criteria. These decisions have helped guarantee the quality of the publications on the platform. The figures concerning the number of applications submitted are available on a [dedicated web page](#).

OpenEdition Books

The scientific board decides which new publishers or collections applying to OpenEdition Books are accepted. The board appraises applications once every six weeks on average, assisted by online collaboration tools. Each member issues a reasoned opinion (favourable, conditional, unfavourable). The board has the final say on whether to accept or reject a publisher or collection.

The Books validation committee includes the manager of the Freemium Service for OpenEdition Books, the manager of the Books and Journals Service, the deputy director of the Publishing Division, and the director of OpenEdition. It is chaired by the membership officers.

The final appraisal is based on the opinion issued by the OpenEdition Books validation committee, which gives applications an overall rating from A to D (A = high priority; B = medium priority; C = deferred; D = rejected).

The figures concerning the number of applications submitted are available on a [dedicated web page](#).

Governance of OpenEdition's scientific board

The scientific board elects a chair and deputy chairs who are in charge of specific tasks relating to OpenEdition Books and OpenEdition Journals. Together they form the scientific board's management committee.

When an application is received for OpenEdition Journals or OpenEdition Books, it is reviewed by the OpenEdition membership team initially. If certain aspects do not appear to match the criteria for the platforms, the team sometimes requests an opinion from the management committee and the director of OpenEdition. A good example of the need for this is when a publication does not appear to fall within OpenEdition's disciplinary scope.

The chair of the scientific board is a member of OpenEdition's [steering committee](#). The committee includes the director of OpenEdition and representatives of its parent institutions.

Find out more about the [governance of OpenEdition's scientific board](#).

Calenda's scientific board

The Calenda platform has its own scientific board that follows the platform's development closely. [Calenda's scientific board](#) is made up of ten or so members from a broad range of humanities and social science disciplines.

The board sets out the scientific orientations and editorial scope of the calendar. It ensures the smooth running of the calendar by helping the team define and implement the inclusion and exclusion criteria for events published online (see Calenda's [editorial scope](#)).

The members of Calenda's scientific board share the same ideal of being open to the different disciplinary subject matters and fields offered by the humanities and social sciences, including more unusual ones: novel research topics, action research, participatory research, emerging fields of research, minority language communities, etc.

Members are expected to remain neutral in "scholarly disputes" and sensitive to the variety of research traditions that exist within different disciplines, including those that are far removed from their own practices.

Calenda's scientific board works closely with [the OpenEdition team](#).

The board sometimes asks the OpenEdition team for advice on announcements they consider problematic or unprecedented. The team members give their opinion on whether the events fall within Calenda's editorial scope.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria for deciding whether events fall within Calenda's scientific and editorial scope have already been drawn up. For example, events should chiefly address the academic community within the humanities and social sciences. Also, the speakers at events such as conferences should primarily come from the humanities and social sciences research community.

The members of Calenda's scientific board may also be asked for guidance on Calenda's scientific orientations, such as its scientific and editorial scope. The Calenda team can also turn to board members, as representatives of the humanities and social sciences community, for an opinion and advice on the calendar's features or ongoing projects involving the platform.

Hypotheses' scientific board

The Hypotheses platform has its [own scientific board](#) that follows the platform's development closely. It is made up of twenty or so members from a broad range of humanities and social science disciplines. It is supported by three additional language-specific scientific boards: one for German, one for Spanish and one for English.

Hypotheses' scientific board works closely with [the OpenEdition team](#).

The board works to promote direct scholarly communication in the humanities and social sciences.

The work of the scientific board includes:

- examining blog applications within the scope of the Hypotheses platform, with the OpenEdition team;
- reflecting on “best practices” for scholarly blogging and making new suggestions, as well as proposing guidelines for blogs published on Hypotheses (read [the scientific board's publication on this](#), the content of which is likely to evolve over time);
- steering events with the OpenEdition team from a scholarly perspective, as was the case with the [event organized to celebrate Hypotheses' 10th anniversary](#).

Hypotheses' language-specific scientific boards (German, Spanish and English) address matters submitted to them by Hypotheses' scientific board.

The scientific board convenes at least twice a year via video conference or at OpenEdition's offices in Marseille. The dates are set at the start of each academic year and the meetings organized by the Hypotheses team. Additional plenary or smaller meetings may be organized if necessary at the request of Hypotheses' scientific board or team members.