New York University Review of Law & Social Change Bylaws

I. Definitions

A. The *New York University Review of Law & Social Change* ("RLSC") is an academic Journal, edited by students at the New York University School of Law. RLSC publishes progressive legal scholarship related to social change in four issues per year.

B. "Social change" refers to theories and practices that promote equality, democracy and sustainable prosperity; seek to increase social, economic, and political equity; empower otherwise marginalized or subordinated communities; prioritize challenging structures over simply reforming them; and contemplate radical transformation of our legal system as envisioned by those most directly impacted by the law. This includes but is not limited to exploration of abolition, critical race theory, law and political economy, and the end of systems of apartheid, including in Israel.

C. "Page-to-practice" is a broad term for RLSC's publication philosophy. It refers to scholarship that considers the relationship between the law and peoples' lived experiences. The term should not be construed narrowly to require that each article result in discrete recommendations for practitioners. Rather, it is intended to encompass novel theoretical approaches to intractable legal problems, concrete policy suggestions, and advice to litigators and direct service providers.

D. "Members" include all current editors, Board members, and faculty supervisors of RLSC.

    1. RLSC is made up of Staff Editors, Editors-at-Large, and Board members.

        a. Staff Editors are members in their first year of work for RLSC.

        b. Editors-at-Large are members in their second year of work for RLSC who have not joined the Board.

        c. Board members are members in their second year of work for RLSC who have been selected to join the Board through the process detailed in Section VI.

    2. Members of RLSC commit to one year of service. Staff Editors are highly encouraged to stay on the Journal for an additional year.

    3. For a list of the various roles students play on the Journal, see Appendix A.

E. "Support" means to grant an organization or individual permission to use RLSC's name when promoting a particular issue or cause, or to provide money or other Journal resources to a student or non-student group to enable it to organize an event or other activity.

II. General Principles

   A. **Philosophy of Interpretation**

      1. RLSC recognizes that texts are "living" objects whose meaning changes over time to accord with changing cultural norms and historical practices. This change is both inevitable and frequently a product of the successful struggle for progressive social change. Hence, these bylaws should not be interpreted strictly to refer to the original intent of the drafters, but should be interpreted in accordance with the philosophical principles laid out in this section in order to meet the changing needs and circumstances of the Journal.

   B. **Institutional Philosophy**

      1. RLSC shall ensure that its institutional organization and procedures comply with the philosophical principles laid out in this section. This means that staff selection, Journal operation, and Journal events should be democratically organized, respectful of diversity in both identity and viewpoint, and as concordant with egalitarian and democratic ideals as is possible within the law school environment.

      2. RLSC will seek whenever possible to memorialize its institutional history, to ensure that we can make decisions about our future with full knowledge of our past. RLSC should approach its history with a critical eye, fully acknowledging times in the past and present when it has not lived up to its ideals.

   C. **Environmental Philosophy**

      1. RLSC will strive to conserve resources throughout the publication process. RLSC is committed to making submissions, source pulls, editing, and publishing paperless, as much as possible.

   D. **Equal Access Philosophy**

      1. RLSC will make all past and future issues available for free online. We shall also strive to make the Journal accessible to people who may not be able to easily access it online.

   E. **Space**

      1. RLSC will make its office space available to its members and the progressive community at NYU Law as long as it does not interfere with Journal activity. Organizers of large events should secure permission from the MEs to use office space.

   F. **Bylaws**

      1. The bylaws shall be distributed to all Journal members as part of their initial orientation materials. Copies of the bylaws shall also be posted on the RLSC website and shall be available for free upon request.

G. **Credit**

1. RLSC acknowledges that Journal work can be extremely time-intensive and advocates for NYU policy to be changed to allow 2Ls to receive credit for their work and to allow 3Ls to receive more than two credits.

2. Under the existing structure where 2Ls cannot receive credit and 3Ls can receive a maximum of two credits, all Board members shall receive two credits, and all Editors-at-Large shall receive one credit.

III. Decision-making

A. **Philosophy of Decision-making**

1. Wherever practical, RLSC shall use democratic procedures to make decisions that may affect the Journal or its members, including but not limited to the voting procedures described below.

2. In decision-making, RLSC should strive for consensus while recognizing it may not always be achievable.

3. In most cases, votes will be conducted by the full Journal. In the following exclusive cases, votes will be confined to the Board:

   a. Changes to bylaws
   b. Changes to size of Board and Journal membership
   c. Changes to Journal position roles
   d. Addition or removal of Journal positions
   e. Creation of special issues
   f. Selection of new Board members
   g. Removal of Board members

4. Changes to material contained in the appendices of the bylaws do not require a formal vote.

B. **Philosophy of Support and Sponsorship**

1. As members of the progressive community, we recognize the value of contributing to ongoing debates over the means and ends of legal and policy changes, both within the community and more broadly. As a Journal, we hope to stimulate discussions about what constitutes social change while remaining true to our core principles of publishing articles that reflect and encourage progressive approaches to legal questions and problems.

2. The Journal shall choose to support a particular issue, institution, or cause only upon a successful vote according to the voting procedures listed below. In considering whether to support a particular issue or cause, Journal members should recognize the limits of the Journal's institutional competence.

C. **Voting Process**
1. Board and full Journal votes will follow the same process.
2. Voting shall be the preferred method for making decisions that will affect the future of the Journal and the workload of its members. For example, voting shall be used to determine whether the Journal should sponsor an issue or cause, publish an outside symposium, etc. Any member of the Journal may introduce a proposal that requires a yes or no vote.
3. For all votes, an online poll will be created and sent out to either the Board or the full Journal by the Managing Editors prior to the vote to allow discussion of the proposal and suggestions for amendments. This poll will remain open for a reasonable time in order, contingent upon the urgency of the vote, in order to provide voters with the opportunity to vote and comment on any proposal.
4. For binary Yes/No votes, the following process will be used:
   a. The poll will have three options, "Yes," "No," and "Need more information or Unsure."
   b. During the voting period, the Managing Editors will create and share a document where anonymous comments made using the online poll will be posted.
   c. If a majority of votes are No, the proposal is defeated. The proposal can be introduced again the following semester.
   d. If a majority of votes are Yes, the proposal passes and is implemented immediately.
   e. In all other cases, the vote is postponed for a reasonable time while discussion continues. After this reasonable time period another vote occurs with only two options: "Yes" or "No."
   f. A quorum of the Journal, predetermined before the vote by the Managing Editors on a case by case basis, must vote. Otherwise, as above, after a reasonable period of time another vote will occur without the third option. If the second vote also fails to have at least a quorum of the Journal vote, the proposal is defeated.
5. If a binary Yes/No vote does not make sense given the context of the vote (for example, choosing between three options for a communication platform), the following approval voting process will be used:
   a. The poll will have as many options as necessary, as well as one option for "Need more information/Unsure."
   b. Journal members will be able to select as many or as few options as they wish.
   c. During the voting period, the Managing Editors will create and share a document where anonymous comments made using the online poll will be posted.

<ol type="d" start="4">
The option that receives the most votes *and* a majority of votes cast will prevail.
If no option receives a majority of votes cast, the vote is postponed for a reasonable time while discussion continues. After this reasonable time period another vote occurs with only two options representing the top two vote-getters from the first vote.
A quorum of the Journal, predetermined before the vote by the Managing Editors on a case by case basis, must vote. Otherwise, as above, after a reasonable period of time another vote will occur with only two options representing the top two vote-getters from the first vote. If the second vote also fails to have at least a quorum of the Journal vote, the proposal is defeated

IV. Production Process

A. Content Selection Principles

1. In choosing which articles to publish, Journal members shall consider the following:

   a. Whether the article advocates for social change

   b. Whether the article reflects the page-to-practice principle

   c. How publication would amplify voices traditionally underrepresented in legal academia

   d. How publication would affect the overall diversity of authors published by the Journal

   e. The amount of work that will be required by Journal members to make the article publication-ready

2. The Journal is committed to publishing a mix of work by students, practitioners, and academics.

B. Editorial Principles

1. The Journal shall embody its ideological principles in its editorial principles.

2. The Journal shall:

   a. Use "they" as the preferred generic pronoun unless its usage would cause confusion.

   b. Not use designations of student work, such as "note" or "comment." Student-written articles receive the same designation as articles by academics and practitioners, and will be cited in RLSC articles without any additional designation.

c. List all authors of a particular work in the cites, including the short cites. The "et al." form is never used. Hereinafters may be used to shorten subsequent citations.

d. Order all articles within an issue of RLSC in alphabetical order by the first author's last name, not by their position in an institutional hierarchy.

3. The Journal shall create a Style Guide, published on the website and reviewed and updated yearly by the Board, with guidance on referring to particular racial, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, or other identity groups in an article. However, the Journal understands that such decisions are often best addressed on an individual basis. If an author seeks to use terminology not in line with the Style Guide, the article staff will:

a. Discuss the choice of terminology with the author; and

b. Include a footnote in the article explaining the choice of terms.

4. The Journal shall follow the most current edition of the Bluebook on questions of citation and style. Transition to new editions of the Bluebook should take place such that all issues of a given volume of the Journal are edited to comply with the same edition.

5. The Journal shall create a Production Manual, reviewed and updated yearly by the Board, with guidance on RLSC-specific formatting and content conventions.

C. For any stylistic issue not covered by these Bylaws, the Bluebook, or the Production Manual, RLSC follows the most current edition of the Chicago Manual of Style.

V. Colloquia

A. **Colloquium Principles**

1. Topics for Journal-sponsored colloquia should, like articles, advocate for social change, reflect the page-to-practice philosophy, and strive to amplify voices underrepresented within legal academia.

2. Colloquia should include presenters from a variety of perspectives and professions and should have relevance for an audience of students, practitioners, policymakers, and academics. In organizing the panels, etc., the Journal shall avoid reproducing the academic/practitioner divide.

B. When RLSC organizes a colloquium event, participants in the colloquium may submit articles to be published in a special colloquium issue of the Journal.

C. RLSC may also agree to publish a special issue in connection with a symposium that was organized by an entity or organization other than RLSC.

D. Articles submitted for publication in connection with an RLSC colloquium have a presumption of publishability. These articles do not go through the same

screening and selection process as articles submitted directly to the Journal. However, as with SADE articles, each article may still be rejected if the EICs determine that the article doesn't have the basic characteristics required of publishable articles. Such characteristics may include, among other things, sufficient length, sufficient citations, and quality of writing.

VI. SE and Board Selection

A. Philosophy of Selection

1. As a Journal, we recognize that ideological and identity-based diversity strengthen our community.
2. The Journal shall choose its members to reflect the diversity of the progressive community at NYU School of Law. In order to do so, the Journal shall consider a broad range of criteria, including but not limited to: students' dedication to public interest law or progressive causes, their academic or personal interests, their personal history and background, and their unique skills.
3. Because RLSC does not believe law school grades provide an accurate indication of individual capability, the Journal shall not consider student grades when selecting future members.
4. Because the majority of requirements for the NYU writing competition place undue stress on students and do not provide an accurate indication of individual capability, the Journal shall only require a resume and personal statement from applicants.
5. RLSC will always accept Staff Editor applications from new 3L, transfer, LLM, and JSD students.
6. As part of maintaining a culture of inclusivity, RLSC does not cap the number of Staff Editors it accepts. However, Board members should remain conscious of the staffing needs of other journals when determining the number of Staff Editors to accept.
7. The process for Staff Editor and Board selection shall be transparent, fair, honest, and respectful.

B. Board Selection

1. In November, the current Board will hold an information session on the Board selection process for current 2Ls, detailing the application timeline and the roles of different Board positions
2. In late December or early January, the current Managing Editors will send out:
   a. Board applications, consisting of the following questions:
      i. The applicant's position interest ranking
      ii. Whether the applicant is interested in being a liaison
      iii. Why the applicant is interested in the positions they indicated

- iv. What the applicant will add as a Board member
- v. What possible availability constraints, including over the summer, the applicant has
- b. Board position descriptions, consisting of:
  - i. The description of each position as detailed in Appendix A
  - ii. A brief evaluation of the workload of each position
  - iii. Any other information the outgoing Board members in each position deem relevant
- c. Anonymous comment form where current SEs can give feedback about their fellow SEs on the following:
  - i. Qualifications for a specific position
  - ii. Commitment to RLSC's values
  - iii. Communication ability
  - iv. Any other information the Board members may find relevant in evaluating candidates they do not know personally
3. After SEs submit their applications, each applicant will have an interview in the form of an informal conversation with two current Board members. The purpose of this interview is to have an open discussion of interest in and qualifications for various positions as well as resolve any lingering questions.
4. Applicants for the positions of EIC and ME will have separate interviews with the current EICs and MEs.
5. After all applications and interviews are completed, the entire outgoing Board will meet to select the incoming Board. The MEs will create a chart that shows each Board position and every rising 3L applying for that position, sorted first by how highly they ranked that position and then by name. The entire Board will vote to select the new editors for that position. During the selection meeting, the Board members will consider candidates for each Board position based on the following criteria:
   - a. The candidate's ranked preferences
   - b. The candidate's apparent enthusiasm for each position for which they applied, based on conversations with the candidate during and outside of their interview
   - c. The candidate's job and skills experience where they relate to the position for which they applied (e.g., editorial, managerial experience)
   - d. The candidate's performance on article screens based on feedback from the ASEs
   - e. The candidate's performance on C&Ses and source pulls based on feedback from their SAE(s) and EE(s)
   - f. The candidate's involvement in other Journal activities (i.e., committees) and other extracurricular activities

g. The candidate's apparent ability to handle the workload of the position for which they applied

h. Peer comments from anonymous comment form

6. Voting will use the following procedure:

    a. After discussion of all applicants who ranked a particular position first, voting will begin

    b. The first position voted on will be the EICs, followed by the MEs; the order of voting on other positions will be determined by the outgoing MEs in advance of the meeting

    c. A form will be sent to all Board members with the names of all applicants who ranked the position in question first

    d. The Board members will select any and all applicants that they think are best suited to the position they ranked first

    e. All applicants who reach the voting threshold for their position will be elected to these positions

    f. The voting thresholds are as follows:

        i. 100% of all Board members for election of the EICs

        ii. ⅔ of all Board members for election of all other positions

    g. The EIC, ME, and DEE positions are capped at two members. If more than two applicants reach the voting threshold, the following procedure will be followed:

        i. The Board will discuss the applicants who reached the voting threshold

        ii. A second round of voting with only the applicants who reached the threshold listed will be held, with Board members restricted to voting for a maximum of two applicants

        iii. The two applicants who receive the most votes <u>and</u> reach the voting threshold will be elected to the position

        iv. If fewer than two of the applicants reach the voting threshold in this vote, a third vote will be held with only the applicant(s) who received the most votes without reaching the threshold listed, with Board members restricted to voting "Yes" or "No" on the applicant(s)

        v. All applicants who reach the voting threshold on this vote will be elected to the position

      vi. If fewer than two applicants have reached the voting threshold at this point, this process will restart at step VI.B.6.g.i.

h. All other positions are uncapped

i. After voting on all applicants' first choices, all applicants not yet elected to a position will be considered for their second-choice positions, following the same procedures detailed above

j. Voting will continue according to this method until all applicants have been elected to a position or have failed to be elected to any position that they ranked

k. At this point, the Board will consider the overall balance of the elected Board and discuss whether any position(s) need more members (Appendix A provides suggested baseline numbers for each position). A form will be sent to all Board members with a list of all positions (excluding the EICs, MEs, and DEEs) and the choices to vote "Yes" or "No" on the question of whether more members are needed in each position.

l. If a simple majority of the Board votes that more members are needed in any position, the following procedure will be followed:

      i. Board members will nominate members to fill a position from the following pools of candidates, in order:

           1. Applicants not yet elected to a position who ranked the position in question

           2. Applicants not yet elected to a position who did not rank the position in question

           3. Applicants already elected to a position where the position they were elected to has more than enough elected members

           4. Rising 2Ls who did not apply to be on the Board

      ii. After nominations, the same voting procedures detailed above will be followed

      iii. If the Board votes that more members are still needed in any position(s), the MEs will note that a second call for applications should be made

m. After this process has concluded, the MEs will send a document with the elected Board to all outgoing Board members, along with a form to anonymously object to any elected member, whether because of a specific issue with the elected member or because of issues in the procedure followed in electing them

n. Outgoing Board members will have a week to submit detailed objections through the form

o. For all objections that are raised, the following procedures will be followed:
    i. The MEs will email the full Board with the objection and a form to vote on whether or not to reconvene to discuss the objection
    ii. If a ⅔ majority of the full Board votes to reconvene based on any objection, the MEs will schedule a second meeting
    iii. At the second meeting, the objection will be discussed, and the full Board will vote on whether to remove a member from their elected position
    iv. If a simple majority of the full Board votes to remove a member from their elected position, they will be removed from that position
    v. For any member removed from a position, the Board will discuss and vote on whether to elect them to another position, with the voting thresholds in Section VI.B.f in place
    vi. If a member is removed from a position, the Board will discuss and vote on whether a replacement member is needed
    vii. If a simple majority of the full Board votes that a replacement is needed, the MEs will note that a second call for applications should be made

p. After a week has passed and all objections have been addressed, the MEs will take the following steps:
    i. Email all elected members offering them a position on the Board
    ii. Email all applicants who were not elected informing them that they have not been chosen for the Board, but are still eligible to serve as EALs

          iii. Send out a second call for applications for any position that the Board has determined needs more members

    q. If any elected member declines their position, the MEs will send out a form to the full Board to vote on whether they need to be replaced and send out a second call for applications if a simple majority of the full Board votes "Yes"

    r. If a second call for applications is needed, the same application and voting process as detailed above will be followed

    s. Once the full incoming Board has been elected and all elected members have accepted their offered positions, transition will begin in the manner previously determined

C. **Staff Editor Selection**

  1. Applicants and application components

    1. Selection of rising 2Ls for SE positions is done via the school-sponsored 1L writing competition. Rising 2Ls must only submit a resume and a personal statement.

    2. Selection of transfer students and LLMs is done via the school-sponsored transfer writing competition at the end of the summer, prior to the commencement of fall semester. Transfer students must only submit a resume and a personal statement.

    3. Selection of any rising 3Ls is done through a Journal-run application process at the same time as the transfer and LLM writing competitions. Rising 3Ls must only submit a resume and a personal statement.

  2. Role of the Board in SE selection

    a. SE selection will be led by the Staff Development Editors (SDEs). SDEs coordinate the distribution of applications among all Board members and make the final determinations and rankings of applicants.

    b. All incoming Board members are responsible for reading applications.

  3. Evaluation of applications

    a. The number of and components of applications that each Board member must read will be determined by the SDEs.

    b. Each application should be read and evaluated by more than one Board member.

  4. Selection criteria

a. New SDEs have the option of following previous years' selection criteria, or may establish new selection criteria for the selection they will oversee.

b. The current year's selection criteria must be distributed to all Board members reading applications.

c. Selection criteria must always be in keeping with the general principles of RLSC as articulated in these Bylaws.

D. All rising 3Ls who will not be joining the Board will have the opportunity to return to the Journal as Editors-at-Large in their third year. Their intention to return must be communicated to the MEs by the end of July.

VII.   Transition

A. The transition process for each position will be an informal gradual transition decided by the outgoing Board members for that position and the outgoing Managing Editors. The outgoing Board members will organize a training event for their specific position at which responsibilities will begin to transfer to the incoming Board members. Complete transfer will occur at least by the end of the school year.

B. To ensure that Journal work continues without undue stress being placed on any members, outgoing Board members will be expected to take on Staff Editor responsibilities after the majority of their Board role has been transitioned.

VIII.   Resignations and Removals

A. **Resignations**

1. Resignations are strongly discouraged. Staff members may resign in good standing provided they have good cause and give proper notice. Staff members who wish to resign must:

   a. Submit a written statement to the EICs, explaining the reason for their resignation, and;

   b. Wherever possible, complete any and all outstanding assignments.

2. Consequences of resignation and removal can include removal from the masthead and loss of credits for Journal duties, among other things.

3. Empty Board positions may be filled by immediate Board election. In the event that an EIC resigns, the SPE Liaison may serve as an EIC until a new EIC is elected.

B. **Removals**

1. RLSC recognizes that law school is an extremely stressful time, that Journal work is done on a volunteer basis, and that there are a multitude of other reasons that staff members may fail to complete assignments. However, RLSC also recognizes that failure to complete assigned work

creates additional work for other Journal members and that removal is, in extreme circumstances, the only feasible option.

2. Removal from a position should be a last resort utilized only when a staff member has continuously failed to complete assigned tasks, has discussed the issue with the Managing Editors, and has demonstrated a lack of commitment to rectifying the issue.

3. As outlined in each staff member's commitment acknowledgment form (signed at the beginning of each year), the following process will be followed to address continuous failure to complete assignments:

   a. If a staff member fails to complete one assignment without a reasonable excuse, they will receive a warning.

   b. If a staff member fails to complete a second assignment without a reasonable excuse, they must meet with both Managing Editors.

   c. If a staff member fails to complete a third weekly assignment without a reasonable excuse, they must meet with both Managing Editors and both Editors-in-Chiefs. At this point, the Managing Editors and the Editors-in-Chiefs will determine whether the staff member should be removed from their position.

4. At each step of this process, the staff member will be reminded that they may contact the CEAC to arrange any accommodations to help them complete their work.

5. Staff Editor and Editor-at-Large removal shall proceed according to the following process:

   a. The Managing Editors will meet again with the Staff Editor or Editor-at-Large to inform them that they will no longer receive weekly assignments, that they will be removed from the masthead, and that Journal membership and credit will be removed from their transcript.

   b. The Managing Editors will identify any assignments that have not been completed and reassign them to other Staff Editors or Editors-at-Large as regular weekly assignments or as office hours tasks.

   c. The Editors-in-Chief will contact NYU administration to verify the Staff Editor or Editor-at-Large's removal.

6. Board member removal shall proceed according to the following process:

   a. The Managing Editors and Editors-in-Chief will determine whether the Board member could succeed in a different Board position or as an Editor-at-Large and propose this position change to the Board member.

b. If the Board member agrees to move to a different position or leave the Journal entirely, the resignation process will be followed. A Board vote is not required to move a member from one Board position to another.

c. If the Board member does not agree to move to a different position or leave the Journal entirely, the Managing Editors will call a meeting of the full Board. The following process will be followed at this meeting:

    i. The Managing Editors will present the reasons they believe the Board member should be removed from their position.

    ii. The Board member will then have the opportunity to respond.

    iii. The full Board will then be allowed to discuss without the Board member in question present.

    iv. The full Board will then vote on whether to remove the Board member from their position. A ⅔ majority of the full Board is required for removal.

d. If a Board member is removed from their position, the Board will follow the procedure for replacement outlined in Section VIII.A.3.

The various roles students occupy on the Journal may include:

1. **Article Selection Editor (ASE):** The ASEs serve as the gatekeepers to getting published in *Social Change* and *The Harbinger*. They shape the direction of the journal's scholarship and are constantly striving to make article selection as efficient and effective as it can be. ASEs manage the Scholastica database, communicate with authors, do a "first pass" read of all articles that are submitted, review SEs' article screens, facilitate committee reads, make the final publication decisions, and extend offers to the authors. The Board should contain at least five ASEs.

2. **Community Accessibility and Education Coordinator (CEAC):** The CEACs research issues of diversity, accessibility, and inclusion to train and support RLSC board members and staff editors in the execution of their roles. The CEACs produce the *Social Change* Style Guide, a living document that includes the best editing and publishing practices with respect to areas such as race, disabilities, gender identity, and critical perspectives. The CEACs also manage the journal's accommodations process for Staff Editors and board members, acting as a liaison between them and the rest of the board to craft and implement solutions. The CEACs are available to confidentially assist and provide resources to journal members for any accessibility-related reasons. Additionally, the CEACs serve as a liaison for any member who wishes to see a policy change at the journal addressing diversity, accessibility, inclusion, or sustainability, including by workshopping the idea with them and providing resources for the initiative. The CEACs lead and are supported by the Accessibility, Inclusion, and Sustainability Committee. The Board should contain at least one CEAC.

3. **Colloquia Editor (CE):** The CEs coordinate *Social Change* colloquia. The CEs pick colloquia topics, solicit speakers and special issue authors, and handle all colloquia logistics. The CEs lead and are supported by the Colloquia Committee. The Board should contain at least two CEs.

4. **Digital Articles Editor (DAE):** The DAEs are in charge of digital articles and other content in *The Harbinger* and function similar to a combination of the EE and SAE roles on the print side. DAE duties include screening articles for digital-specific projects, managing the SEs in Source Pull and C&S, incorporating those edits, supporting DEEs in maintaining online journal presence, and performing above- and below-the-line editing for digital content. The Board should contain at least six DAEs.

5. **Digital Executive Editor (DEE):** The DEEs oversee the content and execution of the entire digital publication process for *The Harbinger* as well as the content and structure of the *Social Change* website and the entirety of the journal's online presence. DEEs design the digital production timeline, manage the digital team and Staff Editors in developing *Harbinger* content, communicate with authors, manage updates to the website and blog, maintain the journal's social media presence (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, etc.), and are always thinking of creative ways to reach a larger audience through *The Harbinger* and the website. The DEEs lead and are supported by the Digital Committee. The Board should contain two DEEs.

6. **Digital Media Editor (DME):** The DME manages the online presence of RLSC, including the structure and content of the Social Change website and all social media platforms. The DME is part of the Digital team but also coordinates with Print regarding online publication of print articles.

7. **Diversity and Activism Coordinator (DAC):** The DAC works to promote diversity and inclusion within the journal and it's membership, and leads the journal's activism within the NYU and larger NYC community. It works closely with the CEAC role to promote accessibility of the journal and establish more artistic and accessible ways of promoting the ideals of RLSC. The Board should contain at least one DAC.

8. **Editor-at-Large (EAL):** The EALs are 3L students who wish to remain members of the RLSC community without taking on the full responsibilities associated with senior Board membership. EALs perform the duties of SEs, assist other senior Board members with their duties, or develop a unique role on the Journal in consultation with the EICs.

9. **Editor-in-Chief (EIC):** The EICs oversee the execution of the entire publication process, as well as all of the journal's programs and projects. They serve as the liaisons between the journal and NYU Law administration, and represent the journal to the community at large. The EICs have their hands in everything. They edit every article multiple times before publication (at each stage of the publication process), they communicate with the authors, design (and re-design) the production timeline, and keep everyone on schedule. They also are responsible for helping *Social Change* evolve through partnerships, events, and new projects. The Board should contain two EICs.

10. **Executive Editor (EE):** The EEs are the citation and proofing experts. These Board members take the lead on tracking down all of the sources and perfecting the citations in each article. They work as a team with the SAE and EIC assigned to their respective articles, and are in charge of all below-the-line edits. EE duties include managing the SEs in Source Pull and performing the below-the-line editing for articles in the production pipeline. The Board should contain at least six EEs.

11. **Liaison:** Each team with more than two members selects a liaison, who manages responsibilities within the team, communicates with the EICs and MEs about issues relevant to their team, and is ultimately responsible for planning training for Orientation and preparing their respective sections for the Production Manual.

12. **Managing Editor (ME):** The MEs serve as liaisons between the SEs and the Board. They oversee all logistical and technical aspects of journal production and office operation, in addition to participating in the teams that make each print article publication-ready. Operational duties include planning and executing Staff Editor orientation and trainings, managing Staff Editor assignments and office hours, maintaining office space and supplies, overseeing program/project implementation, and overseeing Board selection. MEs also have editorial responsibilities at one particular phase of the editing process – proofing. The MEs take turns conducting a secondary proof of each article, following a primary proof by the EEs and prior to a final proof by the EICs. After proofing is completed, MEs are responsible for compiling the entire issue for print, sending the issue to the publisher, and liaising with the publisher. The Board should contain two MEs.

13. **Participatory Law Scholarship Editor (PLSE)**: The PLSE works to ensure that RLSC is publishing and elevating legal expertise and contribution by individuals impacted by the law. The PLSE may achieve this in a range of ways, including but not limited to: overseeing the Participatory Law Scholarship Committee, working with DEEs to ensure the publication of Scholarship From the Inside (SFI) in print, reaching out to authors creating participatory legal scholarship, and coordinating with ASEs in contemplating the makeup of issues of the journal. The Board should contain at least one PLSE.

14. **Professional Development Coordinator (PDC):** The PDC runs the bar matching program for our 3L students, which includes soliciting sign ups, coordinating with the Themis and Barbri reps, and creating the matches. Additionally, the PDC is tasked with arranging guest speakers to come chat with our members about various jobs in different areas of public interest. Finally, the PDC is in charge of the PEI committee and for updating our handbook on clerkships. The Board should contain at least one PDC.

15. **Senior Articles Editor (SAE):** These board members work closely with authors throughout the editing process and are charged with transforming a submitted article into a publishable piece. The SAEs manage the cite and substance checking (C&Sing) of articles in the production pipeline in conjunction with the EEs. Primary duties include reviewing the article and preparing an "author memo" to suggest initial changes to the author, managing the SEs in the C&S process, and incorporating the SE edits and performing their own edits. The Board should contain at least six SAEs.

16. **Student Articles and Practitioner Development Editor (SPADE):** The SPADEs work with students (usually but not exclusively members of RLSC) and practitioners (including but not limited to practicing public interest lawyers, community organizers, advocates, and others interested in legal writing who don't have consistent access to academia) who want to prepare an extended writing project for publication. Their responsibilities include: soliciting student and practitioner work, collaborating with authors to edit and develop their work to meet RLSC's publication standards, and determining when student and practitioner articles are ready to enter the publication pipeline. The Board should contain at least four SPADEs.

17. **Staff Development Editors (SDE):** The SDEs are responsible for staffing Social Change and building community within the journal. They publicize the journal, lead the process of selecting new Staff Editors (SEs), and plan social events throughout the year. SDEs lead and are supported by the Social Committee. The Board should contain at least five SDEs.

18. **Staff Editor (SE):** SEs are first-year members of RLSC. They are responsible for completing weekly assignments such as article screens, committee reads, SADE reviews, source pulls, and C&S checks. They also attend weekly office hours, during which they may be assigned other small tasks.

19. **Supervisory Editor (SPE):** The SPEs work closely with SAEs and EEs to help and review their work and edit the article at each stage of the production process. The SPEs will meet frequently with the EICs to keep the print production calendar on track for all articles in production. The Board should contain at least two SPEs.

Committees are groups designed to perform specific functions within the Journal. They are staffed and may be led by any Journal member. Any Journal member may also create a new committee by speaking with the Managing Editors. Committee activity will vary from year to year based on membership and needs. Committees may include:

1. **Accessibility, Inclusion and Sustainability (AIS):** The AIS Committee works on projects addressing accessibility, inclusion, and/or sustainability in the Journal. It is traditionally led by the CEACs.
2. **Colloquium:** The Colloquium Committee assists the Colloquium Editors with putting together our annual RLSC Colloquium. It is traditionally led by the CEs.
3. **Cross-Journal Organizing (CJO):** The CJO Committee focuses on cross-journal solidarity, organizing the journals for greater compensation/support, and creating cross-journal initiatives that can address larger issues with legal academia as a whole.
4. **Digital:** The Digital Team is responsible for upkeep of the *Harbinger*, RLSC's digital publication. Because the *Harbinger* does not have to follow the print production calendar, the Digital Team produces shorter, more-time sensitive, and innovative works (some of which fall outside the normal scholarly article parameters). Digital Committee members work with the Digital Team to get pieces ready for publication, engage with authors and solicit articles, etc. It is traditionally led by the DEEs.
5. **Palestine Solidarity (PSC):** The PSC focuses on works related to the representation of Palestinian (and diaspora) voices, narratives, and issues in legal academia and on how to provide ways for RLSC to leverage its role as a legal journal to help promote Palestinian rights.
6. **Participatory Law Scholarship (PLS):** The Participatory Law Scholarship (PLS) Committee is dedicated to redefining legal expertise by elevating the voices of individuals impacted by the law. Grounded in achieving RLSC's mission of page-to-practice scholarship, the PLS works to ensure that the Journal centers the voices of those most impacted by the law. The voices of those individuals must shape our practice, scholarship, and careers.
7. **Public Interest Employment (PIE):** The PIE Committee works to mine RLSC's institutional resources and build out capacity for projects related to the professional advancement of students in public interest. One project is updating our clerkship guide, which involves interviewing RLSC alumni who did clerkships to gather information about clerking and applying to clerk. Another is sharing fellowship or job opportunities within the RLSC community.
8. **Social:** The Social Committee is responsible for hosting events for the journal. These events can take a range of forms, including release parties, advocacy-focused events, and purely social events. It is traditionally led by the SDEs.
9. **Urgent Response (URC):** RLSC is one of the largest progressive student organizations on campus. In the past RLSC members have worked to respond to injustices both within the NYU community and the world. The goal of the URC is to facilitate rapid responses to these incidents. The committee's primary responsibility is to engage with other organizing groups on campus to assist in responses to real world events. The committee

can also play a more proactive role in organizing RLSC's members in the interest of advancing the values of the journal.