

Editorial Board Diversity at the Basket of Eight Journals: A Report to the College of Senior Scholars

Cynthia Beath, University of Texas at Austin cbeath@mail.utexas.edi
Yolande Chan, Queen's University ychan@queensu.ca
Robert Davison, City University of Hong Kong isrobert@cityu.edu.hk
Alan Dennis, Indiana University ardennis@indiana.edu
Jan Recker, University of Cologne jan.recker@wiso.uni-koeln.de

Executive Summary

At ICIS 2019, the College of Senior Scholars appointed a committee to investigate diversity in the editorial boards of the Basket of Eight Journals. Editorial board diversity, we believe, is a signal that the journal is open to and inclusive of all authors. The committee compared the gender, regional and ethnic diversity of the editorial boards to that of AIS Academic member of the eight journals with baseline data for the Academic members of the AIS. This comparison showed that the journals overall have fewer female members than might be reasonably expected, that editorial boards are populated by members from Region 1 more, and Region 3 less, than might be reasonably expected, and that there are more editorial board members of Indian ancestry than might be reasonably expected, while several other ethnicities appear on editorial boards in smaller numbers than might be reasonably expected, based on the prevalence of these ethnicities among AIS Academics. The individual journals differ a great deal among themselves with respect to these diversity criteria, with every journal falling below what might be reasonably expected with respect to either gender, regional or ethnic diversity. The report concludes with recommendations for the College of Senior Scholars, for the EICs of the Basket of Eight Journals, and for AIS Council (and leaders of other organizations of IS scholars).

Introduction

In 2018, AIS Council adopted a statement on diversity and inclusion with emphasis on participation in all AIS events and communities (see Appendix). At ICIS 2019 in Munich, during the panel hosted by the College of Senior Scholars, the team of panelists raised the question of whether AIS had problems with diversity and inclusion. Subsequently, at the meeting of the College of Senior Scholars, Jane Fedorowicz offered a provisional “yes” to this question. She presented the results of a survey on Diversity and Inclusion that was carried out in 2019 on behalf of the College of Senior Scholars.

The report¹ examined the gender, regional, and ethnicity composition of the AIS membership as well as that of the College of Senior Scholars, the 25 AIS presidents, and the AE boards at the Basket of Eight journals. In the report's data on AIS as a whole, the ratio of men to women was about 1.27:1; regional membership distribution was R1=47%, R2=36%, R3=16%. AIS does not maintain data on the ethnicity of members. The report noted that:

- the College of Senior Scholars (83% male, 82% from R1 and R2) is representative of the AIS membership in regard to its regional representation but not gender;
- the 25 AIS presidents (92% male, 80% Caucasian) are not representative of the AIS membership in regard to gender or, it is likely, ethnicity;
- the male/female ratio among AEs ranged from 1.4:1 to 3.9:1 for seven journals, while one journal (JMIS) was reported to have a male/female ratio of more than 12:1 among its AEs. It was noted that between 2000 and 2019 the male/female ratio among AEs came closer to that of AIS at all journals except ISR.

During the discussion that followed, a number of views were expressed with respect to the need for, and the value of, diversity on the editorial boards of the College of Senior Scholars' Basket of Eight journals. Two proposals were made during this discussion. The first proposal was that key institutions of the AIS, including the Basket of Eight journals, would be expected to reflect and represent the diversity of the AIS membership. The second proposal was that a journal currently in the Basket of Eight be delisted by the College of Senior Scholars if it failed to show that it was moving to address diversity and inclusion in its structures.²

As a result of this discussion, the decision was reached that a more careful investigation of diversity in the Basket of Eight journal editorial boards needed to be undertaken before any concrete actions could be considered. Volunteers were solicited to form a task force to examine the issue of journal editorial board diversity. The task force members were Cynthia Beath, Yolande Chan, Robert Davison, Alan Dennis, and Jan Recker.

¹ This report can be found here: https://higherlogicdownload.s3.amazonaws.com/AISNET/ff3612b1-c1e0-4591-bdd0-e0c1b63fe7e2/UploadedImages/CSS_Diversity_and_inclusion_2019.pptx. (Accessed July 10, 2020).

² A copy of the minutes of this meeting can be obtained from the coordinator of the College of Senior Scholars. The current coordinator's name can be found here: <https://communities.aisnet.org/seniorscholars/home> (Accessed July 10, 2020).

The goal of the task force was to identify the extent to which the editorial board of each journal in the Basket of Eight was reflective of AIS membership³ in terms of gender,⁴ region, and ethnicity.⁵ We believe that the AIS Basket of Eight journals should be open, encouraging and supportive of all authors of great research, irrespective of the journal's size, particular strategic positioning or niche, and that their editorial boards should reflect the diversity of the AIS membership to communicate or signal a commitment to fairness to all submitters. We acknowledge that not every AIS member is qualified to be an editorial board member, but there is no reason to conclude that those who are qualified are significantly and meaningfully different from the broad membership of AIS in demographic terms (and if there were to be differences, the goal would be to reduce such systemic bias).

Methods

We focused on gender, region, and ethnicity of the editorial boards of the Basket of Eight journals in comparison to the diversity in the AIS membership as a whole. One might argue that some journals may strive to serve certain constituencies and thus should be assessed against those constituencies, not the IS community as a whole. For example, *ISR* is published by *INFORMS* (which is US centric) while *EJIS* includes the European region in its name. We believe that journals in the Basket of Eight should serve the world as a whole, rather than some narrower constituency, thus we chose to use the global AIS membership as the point of comparison.

To assess the diversity in the AIS membership as a whole, we used membership data from AIS as of January, 2020. We used the 3210 members who were Academic members as the baseline group (excluding those who were Student, Professional, or Retired members), reasoning that Academic members would form the pool of candidates from which editorial board members would be drawn.

- 3 AIS is our target population. We acknowledge that AIS membership is less diverse than the global population of IS Scholars.
- 4 Although the terms gender and sex are often used interchangeably, we acknowledge that strictly speaking, sex refers to “a set of biological attributes in humans and animals ... and is usually categorized as female or male” whereas gender refers to “the socially constructed roles, behaviors, expressions and identities of girls, women, boys, men, and gender diverse people”. See the Canadian Institutes of Health Research definitions at <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/48642.html>. We use the term gender in this report to refer to “sex.”
- 5 According to the American Psychological Association, “*race* refers to physical differences that groups and cultures consider socially significant. For example, people might identify their race as Aboriginal, African American or Black, Asian, European American or White, Native American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Māori, or some other race. *Ethnicity* refers to shared cultural characteristics such as language, ancestry, practices, and beliefs. For example, people might identify as Latino or another ethnicity” (<https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/bias-free-language/racial-ethnic-minorities>). We use the term ethnicity to refer to “racial and ethnic identity.”

We used AIS’ publicly reported proportions to establish the gender and regional diversity of AIS’s Academic members (Table 1). The gender proportion omits anyone who did not report gender. The region code is based on the region where the member currently worked. One member of the task force coded the ethnicity of AIS’s Academic members. We used the US census and other sources to develop our ethnicity categories for analysis. We coded Academics as Hispanics only if they were working in Region 1, because the category has no significance in Regions 2 and 3. Academics of Latin American descent in Region 2 or 3 were coded as “Caucasian/European.” Coding ethnicity is challenging (not just because many people are of mixed ethnicities) so there is some element of inexactness in the proportions reported in Table 1.

Table 1: Reported proportions in AIS Academic members

Dimension	Distribution in AIS Academic membership (n = 3210)	
	%	St. Dev.
Gender		
Female	33%	0.8%
Male	67%	0.8%
Region		
1	45%	0.8%
2	31%	0.6%
3	24%	0.6%
Ethnicity		
Chinese	19%	0.8%
Indian Subcontinent	8%	0.8%
Other Asian	7%	0.3%
Black/African Descent	2%	0.3%
Caucasian/European Descent	54%	0.8%
Middle Eastern Descent	8%	0.5%
Hispanic (only in Region 1)	2%	0.2%
Other	< 1 %	

Our analysis of the Basket of Eight journal editorial boards is summarized in Table 2. In Table 2, a yellow highlighted cell indicates that a journal value is below the AIS population value by five standard deviations (SD) or more. A blue highlighted cell indicates that a journal value is above the AIS population value by five standard deviations (SD) or more. For our analysis, we used either a journal's published Editorial Board or its published list of Senior Editors and Associate Editors. Our reasoning was that these are the individuals mainly responsible for the management and evaluation of submissions. We did not include members of advisory boards or honorary boards in our analysis. Each task force member coded the members of two journals' boards using publicly available materials on the Web, including profile pages, biographies, and images. Where required, board members were contacted directly to request clarification. Our data on editorial boards was validated by the editors-in-chief and is current as of May 2020.

We examined several approaches to assessing whether a journal's editorial board was reflective of AIS membership. We chose to focus on the reported proportions of AIS Academic members to calculate an expected value in each category. For each journal, we used the size of the editorial board and the AIS proportion of a category to compute an expected number of board members in each category. For example, if a journal has 100 members on its board, and 33% of AIS Academic members are female, we would expect the journal to have about 33 female board members.

No journal can be expected to exactly match the composition of its board to the AIS proportions, so we also wanted to identify some range around the expected value as a reasonable basis for identifying differences and promoting discussion. We started with three standard deviations around the expected value as a reasonable range (since this usually encompasses 99.7% of a normal distribution), but found that this produced rather narrow ranges, especially for journals with small editorial boards. Therefore, we chose five standard deviations as a range for discussion (usually 99.99% of a normal distribution).

Table 2: Analysis of Basket of Eight Journal editorial boards' proportions with respect to AIS Academic members as of June 2020

Population	AIS population			Basket overall				European Journal of Information Systems				Information Systems Journal				Information Systems Research			
	Size	3210		475				56				66				66			
Statistics	%	SD	5*Std	#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD	
Gender																			
Female	33%	0.8%	4.1%	125	26%	137	176	10	18%	16	21	21	32%	19	24	12	18%	19	24
Male	67%	0.8%	4.1%	350	74%	299	338	46	82%	35	40	45	68%	42	47	54	82%	42	47
Region																			
1	45%	0.8%	4.1%	247	52%	194	233	21	38%	23	28	17	26%	27	32	48	73%	27	32
2	31%	0.6%	3.2%	140	29%	132	162	29	52%	16	19	31	47%	18	23	5	8%	18	23
3	24%	0.7%	3.3%	88	19%	98	130	6	11%	12	15	18	27%	14	18	13	20%	14	18
Ethnicity																			
Chinese	19%	0.8%	4.1%	98	21%	71	110	2	4%	8	13	23	35%	10	15	29	44%	10	15
Indian Subcontinent	8%	0.8%	3.9%	86	18%	20	56	1	2%	2	7	6	9%	3	8	21	32%	3	8
Other Asian	7%	0.3%	1.5%	9	2%	26	40	1	2%	3	5	1	2%	4	6	2	3%	4	6
Black/African Descent	2%	0.3%	1.5%	11	2%	4	18	3	5%	0	2	2	3%	1	3	0	0%	1	3
Caucasian/European Descent	54%	0.8%	4.1%	245	52%	237	276	44	79%	28	33	32	48%	33	38	10	15%	33	38
Middle Eastern Descent	8%	0.5%	2.3%	26	5%	27	49	5	9%	3	6	2	3%	4	7	4	6%	4	7
Hispanic (R1 Only)	2%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0%	11	11	0	0%	1	1	0	0%	2	2	0	0%	2	2
Other	<1%																		

Table 2: Analysis of Basket of Eight Journal editorial boards' proportions with respect to AIS Academic members as of June 2020
(continued)

Population	Journal of the Association for Information Systems				Journal of Information Technology				Journal of Management Information Systems				Journal of Strategic Information Systems				MIS Quarterly			
	Size	50			Size	44			Size	68			Size	59			Size	66		
Statistics	#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD		#	%	+/- 5 SD	
Gender																				
Female	11	22%	14	19	17	39%	13	16	11	16%	20	25	22	37%	17	22	21	32%	19	24
Male	39	78%	31	36	27	61%	28	31	57	84%	43	48	37	63%	37	42	45	68%	42	47
Region																				
1	31	62%	20	25	10	23%	18	22	51	75%	28	33	24	41%	24	29	45	68%	27	32
2	11	22%	14	17	25	57%	12	15	9	13%	19	23	20	34%	16	20	10	15%	18	23
3	8	16%	10	14	9	20%	9	12	8	12%	14	19	15	25%	12	16	11	17%	14	18
Ethnicity																				
Chinese	11	22%	7	12	0	0%	7	10	7	10%	10	16	6	10%	9	14	20	30%	10	15
Indian Subcontinent	11	22%	2	6	3	7%	2	5	17	25%	3	8	10	17%	2	7	17	26%	3	8
Other Asian	1	2%	3	4	0	0%	2	4	0	0%	4	6	2	3%	3	5	2	3%	4	6
Black/African Descent	2	4%	0	2	1	2%	0	2	1	1%	1	3	0	0%	0	2	2	3%	1	3
Caucasian/European Descent	25	50%	25	29	37	84%	22	26	36	53%	34	39	41	69%	29	34	20	30%	33	38
Middle Eastern Descent	0	0%	3	5	3	7%	2	5	6	9%	4	7	1	2%	3	6	5	8%	4	7
Hispanic (R1 Only)	0	0%	1	1	0	0%	1	1	0	0%	2	2	0	0%	1	1	0	0%	2	2
Other																				

Data Analysis

Our goal was to identify the extent to which each journal's board was reflective of AIS's Academic membership in terms of gender, region, and ethnicity.

Overall Pattern:

We began with an overall assessment of the Basket of Eight as a whole. As of June 2020, the eight journals have a total of 475 board members.

We interpreted our data in light of our expectation that the editorial boards of the Basket of Eight journals would be reflective of AIS Academic membership in the diversity dimensions considered. The results show that the Basket journals have more men (74%) and fewer women (26%) on their boards than reasonably expected (using a five standard deviations range) given the current ratio of women and men Academics in AIS. Likewise, more board members are drawn from Region 1 (52%) than reasonably expected, and fewer from Region 3 (19%) than reasonably expected, given AIS's regional diversity. In terms of ethnicity, the results show that more board members are of Indian ethnicity (18%) than expected, while there are fewer than reasonably expected board members who are Other Asian (2%), Middle Eastern (5%) or Hispanic (0%). 1.5% of board members are of Black/African descent which is within a five standard deviations range of their 2% AIS membership.

For the most part, these imbalances in reflection are not large: to correct them, the eight journals would have to find 12 more women editors, 10 more editors from Region 3, 17 more Other Asians, 1 more person of Middle Eastern descent, and 11 more Hispanics (e.g., people from Mexico, Central and South America working in Region 1). These are small changes in the 475 board members (3%, 2%, 4%, <1%, and 2%, respectively).

Gender:

Four of the Basket of Eight journals (EJIS, ISR, JAIS and JMIS) have fewer women and more men than reasonably expected. Three journals (ISJ, JSIS and MISQ) have gender proportions in the reasonably expected ranges. One journal (JIT) actually has one more woman than reasonably expected and one less man than reasonably expected. JIT has the smallest editorial board, so their +/-5 SD ranges on gender are narrow (4 people).

To correct the current imbalances of EJIS, ISR, JAIS and JMIS, the journals would need to add at least 6, 7, 3, and 9 women to their boards, respectively. With more than a thousand female Academics (just in AIS) to pick from, even assuming that the journals' standards are so high that only 1% of Academics qualify, this still seems like a manageable change.

Please note that our analysis does not examine gender diversity within regions, because there is not much difference among the regions. As noted in Table 1, among AIS Academics 33% are women. The region/gender breakdown is: in Region 1, 30% women, in Region 2, 31% women, and in Region 3, 36% women.

Region:

Since the AIS is "the premier global association of IS scholars" it is important that the College of Senior Scholars' 'Basket of Eight' journals reflects that global ethos. We expect that all journals in the basket should seek to publish research from the broad community of IS scholars across all regions and demographic groups and to offer fair treatment to every submission.

We note first that JSIS has a regional distribution of editors that match our expectations.

Four journals (ISR, JAIS, JMIS and MISQ) have higher reflection of Region 1 editorial board members than reasonably expected. These same journals have fewer Region 2 representatives on their editorial boards than reasonably expected and fewer Region 3 representatives than reasonably expected. These shortfalls may reflect the historical focus of these three journals on Region 1, and they are also larger for region than for gender. To fall within the target range, the four journals would have to increase the number of editors from Regions 2 and 3 by at least 16, 6, 18, and 13, respectively.

Three journals (EJIS, ISJ and JIT) have higher than reasonably expected numbers of editorial board members from Region 2, reflecting, no doubt, their historical focus on Region 2. These journals also have fewer than reasonably expected board members from Region 1. ISJ and JIT have reasonably expected numbers of editors from Region 3. To fall within a five standard deviations range, these three journals would need to increase the number of editors from Region 1 (for ISJ and JIT) or for both Regions 1 and 3 (for EJIS) by at least 10, 8 and 10, respectively.

Ethnicity:

As noted, coding ethnicity is imperfect. Nevertheless, we offer this analysis.

Academic members of ethnic Chinese descent have higher representation than reasonably expected on the editorial boards of three journals (ISJ, ISR, MISQ) and lower representation than reasonably expected on four journals (EJIS, JIT, JMIS and JSIS). For the latter journals, the gap is 6, 7, 3, and 3 members, respectively.

Academic members originating from the Indian subcontinent have higher representation than reasonably expected on the editorial boards of five journals (ISR, JAIS, JMIS, JSIS and MISQ). Their representation is lower than reasonably expected on the EJIS board.

Academic members of “Other Asian” descent (i.e. not Chinese or Indian subcontinent) are represented less than reasonably expected on all the editorial boards. The total gap is 17 members across all journals. AIS has more than 200 members from countries like Thailand, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, and Vietnam, some of whom will not be of Chinese or Indian descent.

There are no Academic members who are Black or of African descent on the board of ISR; the addition of one member of Black or African descent would enable the journal to fall within the five standard deviations range. There are also no Academic members who are Black or of African descent on the board of JSIS. However, because of the size of their editorial board, this falls within the range of what can be reasonably expected. EJIS has one more Black board member than reasonably expected. The other five journals have either 1 or 2 board members who are Black or of African descent. These numbers are within the five standard deviations range for those journals.

Academic members who are Caucasian or of European descent are represented in higher than reasonably expected numbers on the boards of three journals (EJIS, JIT, and JSIS). They are represented in lower than reasonably expected numbers on the ISJ, ISR, and MISQ boards.

Academic members of Middle Eastern descent have lower representation than reasonably expected on the boards of three journals (ISJ, JAIS, and JSIS). The gaps are 2, 3, and 2 members, respectively. The other 5 journals have editors of Middle Eastern descent within the five standard deviations ranges.

There are no Hispanic Academic members on any of the editorial Basket of Eight editorial boards.⁶ There are around 60 Hispanic Academic members in AIS at universities throughout Region 1, including at universities in Latin America.

⁶ Please recall that the committee considered “Hispanic” to be an ethnic category that only had meaning in Region 1. Hence someone born and raised in Latin America and working anywhere in Region 1 would have

In total, none of the AIS Basket of Eight journals meets all ethnicity targets. However, some journals are noticeably more ethnically diverse than others.

Summary:

Looking at all three dimensions together (gender, region and ethnicity), we see that for most of the journals, their boards deviate from the reasonably expected numbers in most categories. The exception is JSIS, whose editorial board meets expectations for gender and region. Two journals (ISJ and MISQ) meet gender expectations, but not regional or ethnicity expectations.

Limitations:

The diversity and inclusion targets that we use in Table 1 are constantly changing, so alignment at any point in time can be short lived, and diversity and inclusion targets need to be regularly reexamined. In fact, there are proportionally more women (39%) in the AIS Student category than there are in the AIS Academic category (33%), so more women scholars are on the way. Around the globe, approximately 50% of the population are women, substantially higher than the proportion of women among AIS Academics. In a few years, it is likely that the proportion of women among AIS Academics will increase.

Global membership in AIS is growing, in line with AIS policies to create a global community of IS scholars. It is unlikely that gradual demographic shifts in the IS community are going to solve existing problems of diversity and inclusion.

Our analysis does not adequately surface the lack of representation on the eight editorial boards from the southern parts of Region 1 and Region 2. While the analysis does point out that there are no Hispanics on any of the eight journal boards, our regional analysis does not truly highlight the lack of any scholars from Universities south of the US in Region 1 and that there are very few from universities in Africa or the Caribbean on these boards.

We did not analyze length of tenure or membership in AIS. While editorial board member candidates are probably most often found among the 85% of Academic members that received their degrees more than 6 years ago, in a few years, the Academic members will include most of these more junior individuals.

Finally, we used as a baseline for comparison the AIS community of researchers. The IS community comprises many other formal and informal groups of IS researchers besides AIS Academics, including

been coded as Hispanic. The same individual working anywhere in Region 2 or 3 was coded as Caucasian and would, we believe, likely be considered Caucasian by colleagues in those Regions.

Informs' ISS, the Academy of Management's OCIS and TIMS Divisions, DSI, the I-school, CAiSE, WITS, and WISE communities, and others. We have no specific reason to believe that any of these groups of IS researchers has demographics that are markedly different from our sample of AIS Academic members. Moreover, we believe there is significant overlap between the group of AIS Academic members and all of these groups, and the sample of AIS Academics, at 3210 individuals, is to the best of our knowledge the largest.

Comments from Editors in Chief

We shared our data and a draft of this report with preliminary findings with the Editors in Chief of the journals in the Basket of Eight and asked them for comments and suggestions. Most of them noted that they select editorial board members on the basis of prior contributions to the journal (in terms of submissions and reviewing) and fit to the journal's strategy and domain. Most indicated a continuing strong commitment to diversity and inclusion in their editorial board, and most indicated that they sought submissions from all scholars to meet their ambitious publication objectives. Several pointed out limitations to our analysis, which we either incorporated in our revision or pointed out as limitations in the section above.

Recommendations

Since the AIS is "the premier global association of IS scholars" it is important that the College of Senior Scholars' 'Basket of Eight' journals reflects that global ethos. We expect that all journals in the basket should seek to publish research from the broad community of IS scholars across all regions and to offer fair treatment to every submission, irrespective of the journal's size, particular strategic positioning or niche. We also expect that over time AIS's membership will gradually shift to resemble the global population. Any imbalance in gender, region, or ethnicity, if ignored, is likely to get worse in time.

Therefore, we have several recommendations for the College of Senior Scholars, for the Editors of the journals in the Basket of Eight, for AIS, and other organizations of IS scholars. Most of our recommendations address ways in which the service ladder that takes researchers from the role of reviewer to the role of Editor in Chief can be made more diverse and inclusive at each rung. We believe that all the EICs would like to have a much larger pool of great reviewers from which to choose.

Recommendations for the College of Senior Scholars

- Offer online implicit bias training for EICs and SEs of the Basket of Eight journals at times that will accommodate editors in all three regions. Ensure that all gatekeepers know how to be encouraging and inclusive.
- Offer online diversity and inclusion coaching for journal EICs and SEs at times that will accommodate editors in all three regions.
- Ask the EICs of Basket of Eight journals to report annually to the Chair of the Review Committee on their efforts to increase board diversity and inclusion (i.e. what measures they have taken, how well have they worked).
- Repeat the analysis in this report in Q1 2021 and Q1 2022. Keep the same review committee for those two reviews. By 2022, the review committee should be able to identify diversity and inclusion goals for the Basket of Eight journals.
- Set diversity thresholds for the Senior Scholars Basket of Eight Journals as a whole. Ask EICs to work together to collectively achieve them.
- Follow the recommendations of the Diversity and Inclusion task force for colleges in their report, “Diversity and Inclusion in the AIS.” (It can be found here: https://cdn.ymaws.com/aisnet.org/resource/resmgr/insider/AISCommunityReport_final.pdf)

Recommendations for the EICs of the Basket of Eight Journals

- Develop virtual mentoring programs for SE/AEs from underrepresented groups (boot camps, coaching, feedback opportunities). Include online options that do not require the time or expense of travel or conference attendance.
- Host reviewer and AE development workshops as webinars. MISQ and other journals have done this as face-to-face events, but this limits who can attend. For ideas about how to structure this kind of workshop, see: https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57d860b2ff7c5058ba601cb7/t/5d9964393b8a443ed0f00f3e/1570333753527/2019_MISQ_ICIS_Workshop.pdf.
- Offer one-on-one reviewer and associate editor “tryouts” with editorial board members willing to act as mentors, especially for scholars from Medium or Low Human Development countries, from which travel to conferences can be prohibitively expensive.
- Provide regular substantive feedback to new AEs and SEs to build their confidence in their abilities and their value to the journal.
- Identify and provide appropriate developmental opportunities to high performing AEs and SEs in underrepresented groups.
- Ask leaders of all AIS SIGs and Chapters to identify reviewer candidates.
- Create recruiting mechanisms for reviewer candidates who do not have mentors, especially from diverse communities.
- Encourage SEs to participate in the PhD Project ISDSA to get acquainted with underrepresented faculty (you can reach the ISDSA leadership at @IsdsaPhd on Twitter).
- Partner with the AIS Women’s Network to offer reviewer, AE and SE training designed for women scholars.
- Solicit demographic data (along with research domain data) from candidate reviewers or candidate editorial board members for the purpose of having a review process that is inclusive.
- Set diversity and inclusion KPIs for SEs and AEs and measure outcomes. Share these metrics among board members. Use the results when making AE or SE decisions.
- State clearly on journal websites that you seek submissions from all regions, all ethnicities, all genders and that you commit to fair treatment of all submissions. Ensure there is no implicit or explicit bias for or against research conducted in any country or region.
- Report gender, region and ethnicity statistics in the public descriptions of your boards to illustrate inclusivity. Work with publishers as necessary.

- Designate someone on your editorial board to focus on inclusion of diverse editors or editor candidates.
- Solicit feedback on diversity and inclusion from board members.

Recommendations for AIS and other organizations of IS scholars

- Offer reviewer qualification and certification to researchers who lack mentors.
- Curate a public repository of reviewer and author resources.
- Create additional mentoring programs for scholars in underrepresented groups who aspire to review for top journals.
- Customize your review systems (e.g., Scholar One, PCS) to request demographic data from submitters and reviewers for the purpose of assessing progress on your diversity and inclusion goals.
- Set diversity targets and introduce new diversity programs for the association. Collect gender, ethnicity and region data from members for purposes of assessing progress on your diversity and inclusion goals.

Appendix: The AIS Diversity and Inclusion Statement

In July 2018, AIS Council voted to adopt a Diversity and Inclusion Statement that had been proposed by AIS's standing committee on Diversity and Inclusion.

(<https://aisnet.org/general/custom.asp?page=DiversityInclusion>) It states, in part:

“The open exchange of ideas and the freedom of thought and expression are central to the aims and goals of the AIS community. These require an environment that recognizes the inherent worth of every person and a group that fosters dignity, understanding, mutual respect, and that embraces diversity. The AIS community is committed to enabling and promoting all AIS members' full participation in the activities, groups, and decision-making of the AIS without distinction and/or discrimination on the basis of individual or group differences.”

The statement pertains mainly to participation in AIS offerings, including conferences but also other means of member engagement. It defines diversity and inclusion as follows:

Diversity means all the individual or group differences that characterize current and future membership of the Association for Information Systems (AIS) community. These include, but are not limited to, differences in career or employment status, academic rank, geographic location, age, biological sex, citizenship, disability, ethnicity, gender identity or expression, language, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, skin color, and socioeconomic status.

Inclusion means that all AIS members can be involved and participate in any and all AIS activities and groups, depending on their interests and wishes. All AIS members will have their voices heard and valued and have fair and reasonable opportunities to influence AIS policies and decision-making.