

Journal Impact Indicators Quick Reference Guide



V2 December 2016

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
THE PURPOSE OF THIS REFERENCE GUIDE	3
WHO IS THIS DOCUMENT FOR?	3
HOW IT WAS CREATED.....	3
DEFINITIONS: REVIEW PROCESSES	4
PEER REVIEW	4
BLIND REVIEW.....	4
DOUBLE BLIND REVIEW	4
JOURNAL IMPACT INDICATORS	5
ACADEMIC JOURNAL GUIDE (CABS / ABS).....	5
AUSTRALIAN BUSINESS DEANS COUNCIL (ABDC) JOURNAL QUALITY LIST	7
HARZING JOURNAL QUALITY LIST	8
JOURNAL CITATION REPORTS (JCR)	9
FT-50 (PREVIOUSLY FT-45).....	10
SOCIAL SCIENCES CITATION INDEX (SSCI)	10
EMERGING SOURCES CITATION INDEX (ESCI)	11
CABELL’S CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCE (CCI)	11
MISLEADING METRICS	12
PREDATORY JOURNALS	13
BEST PRACTICES FOR CHOOSING QUALITY RESEARCH DISSEMINATION OUTLETS.....	13
BEALL’S LIST	13
DIRECTORY OF OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS (DOAJ)	14
RESOURCES ON JOURNAL ETHICS	15
APPENDIX A	16
MOTION FROM FACULTY COUNCIL ON PREDATORY JOURNALS: MAY 2016.....	16
APPENDIX B	17
EDWARDS SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PREDATORY JOURNAL POLICY: DECEMBER 2016	17

Introduction

The purpose of this reference guide

The purpose of this guide is to provide background information on several commonly used indicators of research/journal impact, as well as some helpful information on “predatory” publishers and journals. There are thousands of possible journals, as well as a multitude of rating and ranking systems available, and many different ways of describing journal impact. As we increase our research intensity at the Edwards School of Business, it will be important to remain informed about this rapidly shifting landscape.

The intent of this guide is not to offer a judgment of any of these lists or systems being better than one another. Rather, the intent is to create awareness and shared understanding about what some of the indicators are and *how each indicator is calculated* (e.g., how is impact defined, what factors go into the rating or ranking, how to interpret what it means), *who publishes or creates the list or rating/ranking system* (e.g., in whose interest is it created, how is it funded), *how can you access the information* (e.g., web link), etc.

Who is this document for?

This reference guide should be useful to collegial process committees, as a way of understanding impact metrics that might be reported in case files and CVs. It should also be useful to faculty members who seek ways of articulating the impact of the research outlets they publish in, deciding where to target their work, and how to avoid potential pitfalls of disreputable journals or publishing companies that can be difficult to detect.

This is designed to be a “living document” – that is, it will be updated regularly and feedback/input from you would be welcomed. For example, if there is an indicator used in your discipline that is not reflected herein, please let me know.

How it was created

Unless otherwise specified, the information in each section was copied from the source website for the rating/ranking/list. For example, information about JCR Impact Factor was copied from the Thomson Reuters website, as they are the publisher of this rating system. The web-links are provided in each section, partly to denote source citation and also so that you can click the link to access the most up-to-date information as needed.

**Thank you to Anna Tavares Neto for helping to locate and assemble some of the information included in this document.*

Feel free to contact me with comments, questions, or suggestions.

Chelsea Willness
Associate Dean, Research & Academic
Edwards School of Business

Definitions: Review Processes

Note: This information is a copied excerpt from the following sources:

<https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers/what-is-peer-review>

<http://editorresources.taylorandfrancisgroup.com/peer-review-introduction/>

Peer Review

Reviewers play a central role in scholarly publishing. Peer review helps validate research, establish a method by which it can be evaluated, and increase networking possibilities within research communities. Despite criticisms, peer review is still the only widely accepted method for research validation.

Peer review has been a formal part of scientific communication since the first scientific journals appeared more than 300 years ago. *The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* is thought to be the first journal to formalize the peer review process.

Blind Review

The names of the reviewers are hidden from the author. This is the traditional method of reviewing and is the most common type by far.

Pros:

- Reviewer anonymity allows for impartial decisions – the reviewers will not be influenced by the authors.

Cons:

- Authors may be concerned that reviewers in their field could delay publication, giving the reviewers a chance to publish first.
- Reviewers may use their anonymity as justification for being unnecessarily critical or harsh when commenting on the authors' work.

Double Blind Review

Both the reviewer and the author are anonymous.

Pros:

- Author anonymity prevents any reviewer bias, for example based on an author's country of origin or previous controversial work.
- Articles written by prestigious or renowned authors are considered on the basis of the content of their papers, rather than their reputation.

Cons:

- Reviewers can often identify the author through their writing style, subject matter or self-citation.

Journal Impact Indicators

There are many different lists or systems for assessing journal impact, which are also used as a proxy for journal/research quality. These lists or systems use different metrics and calculations, sometimes based on very different input data (and there are pros and cons for each of them). The Indicators described below are considered reputable, and most of them are well-known or well-accepted as ways of articulating journal impact. They are not listed in any particular order of importance.

Academic Journal Guide (CABS / ABS)

Note: This information is a copied excerpt from the following sources:

<https://charteredabs.org/academic-journal-guide-2015/>

https://charteredabs.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/AJG105_Methodology.pdf

The primary motivation of the Editors and the Scientific Committee is to provide a level playing field. Emerging scholars will have greater clarity as to which journals to aim for, and where the best work in their field tends to be clustered. By the same measure, publication in top journals gives scholars a recognized currency on which career progress can be based; should personal networks deny its currency in one institution, there will be others who recognize and welcome it.

Created by: The Chartered Association of Business Schools (CABS)

Indicators: ABS Journal Rating (2009, 2010, 2015), "ABS List"

Rating	Meaning of Quality Rating
4*	Journals of Distinction. Within the business and management field including economics, there are a small number of grade 4 journals that are recognized world-wide as exemplars of excellence. Their high status is acknowledged by their inclusion in a number of well-regarded international journal quality lists. The Guide normally rates a journal 4* if they are rated in the highest category by at least three out of the five non-university based listings – Financial Times 45, Dallas List, VHB, Australian Deans' List, CNRS. In addition, journals from core social sciences disciplines that do not appear in those listings may also be rated 4* on the grounds that they are clearly of the best quality and of undisputed relevance to business and management. In the Guide of 2015, this applies to 3 journals from the fields of sociology and psychology.
4	All journals rated 4, whether included in the Journal of Distinction category or not, publish the most original and best-executed research. As top journals in their field, these journals typically have high submission and low acceptance rates. Papers are heavily refereed. Top journals generally have the highest citation impact factors within their field.
3	3 rated journals publish original and well executed research papers and are highly regarded. These journals typically have good submission rates and are very selective in what they publish. Papers are heavily refereed. Highly regarded journals generally have good to excellent journal metrics relative to others in their field, although at present not all journals in this category carry a citation impact factor.
2	Journals in this category publish original research of an acceptable standard. A well regarded journal in its field, papers are fully refereed according to accepted standards and conventions. Citation impact factors are somewhat more modest in certain cases. Many excellent practitioner-oriented articles are published in 2-rated journals.
1	These journals, in general, publish research of a recognized, but more modest standard in their field. Papers are in many instances refereed relatively lightly according to accepted conventions. Few journals in this category carry a citation impact factor.

- **Standardized Impact Factor:** Journal Citation Reports (JCR), SCImago Journal Rank (SJR), and Source Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP).
- **Journal Rankings:** Journal Citation Reports (JCR), SCImago Journal Rank (SJR), and Source Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP).

Methodology: The methodology of the Academic Journal Guide is based on a peer review process which is informed by statistical information relating to citation. The final 'ratings' given to journals are not based purely on weighted averages of journal metrics. Instead, the Guide is the result of peer review and consultation conducted by a Scientific Committee of subject experts with peers on the relative standing of journals in each subject area.

- I. The Guide should be designed primarily to serve the needs of the business and management research community, in terms of both helping authors identify suitable outlets for their work, and where work of a particular level is likely to be clustered
- II. The Guide should classify journals into four categories (1 to 4) plus a Journal of Distinction category, which recognizes the quality of those journals ranked as a 'top' class journal in at least three out of five international listings consulted
- III. The classification process should be stringent and methodical in all cases, embracing five sources of evidence:
 1. The assessments of leading researchers in each of the main fields and sub-fields covered;
 2. The mean citation impact scores for the most recent five-year period (where available);
 3. Evaluation by the Editors and Scientific Committee members of the quality standards, track records, contents and processes of each journal included in the Guide;
 4. The number of times the journal was cited as a top journal in five lists taken to be representative of the 'world' rating of business and management journals; and
 5. The length of time a journal has been established Note that any newly established journals as well as more established journals that were not in the previous 'ABS Guide 2010' enter with a maximum rating of 3 other than in exceptional circumstances
- IV. The Guide should be comprehensive in the coverage of research conducted in business schools internationally, covering a wide range of disciplines, fields and sub-fields within the social sciences and taking an inclusive approach to what constitutes business and management research
- V. The Editors put forward the final classification of all journals included in the Guide, following full consideration of feedback on the last version of the 'ABS Guide 2010' and the recommendations made by a panel of experts representing the main sub-disciplines within the field
- VI. The Editors should publish and justify their working methods and their approach to the issues of classification in a written methodology

To read about the full methodology, visit: https://charteredabs.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/AJG105_Methodology.pdf

How to access:

- Visit <https://charteredabs.org/academic-journal-guide-2015/>
- You will need to create a free account to access the Academic Journal Guide

Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) Journal Quality List

Note: This information is a copied excerpt from the following source:
<http://www.abdc.edu.au/pages/abdc-journal-quality-list-2013.html>

In 2007, ABDC established an ABDC Journal Quality List for use by its member business schools. The aim of this initial list was to overcome the regional and discipline bias of international lists. An independent chair and discipline-specific panels reviewed the ABDC Journal Quality List in 2013 and 2009.

It is anticipated the next major review will be in the second half of 2017 and is likely to follow a similar process to the 2013 review with newly selected panels. In 2016, ABDC undertook an interim review, which had a narrow focus on: 1) new journals started since 1 January 2011; 2) removal of predatory open access journals; 3) change of Field of Research (FoR) grouping; and 4) incorrect factual details - to produce a revised 2016 list.

Created by: Australian Business Deans Council

Indicators: ABDC Rating, "ABDC List"

The ABDC Journal Quality List is based on four mutually exclusive (and collectively exhaustive) rating categories labelled: A*; A; B and C. These quality rating categories are defined as follows (note that the stated % are indicative only):

- **A*:** this is the highest quality category, and indicatively represents approximately the top 5-7% of the journals assigned to the given primary Field of Research panel.
- **A:** this is the second highest quality category, and indicatively represents approximately the next 15-25% of the journals assigned to the given primary Field of Research panel.
- **B:** this is the third highest quality category, and indicatively represents approximately the next 35-40% of the journals assigned to the given primary Field of Research group.
- **C:** this is the fourth highest quality category, and represents the remaining recognized quality journals assigned to the given primary Field of Research panel.

Criteria:

- Have a 'substantive business element' evidenced by >50% of articles over three years written by a business faculty; or >50% of articles over three years being of a business nature.
- Relative standing of the journal to comparable journals listed in the specific discipline; relying mainly on citation metrics and other reputable journal quality lists including recognized disciplinary lists.
- International standing of the editorial board
- Quality of peer-review processes
- Track record of publishing influential papers
- Sustained reputation
- Influence of publications in the journal in relation to hiring, tenure and promotion decisions.

How to access: <http://www.abdc.edu.au/master-journal-list.php>

Harzing Journal Quality List

Note: This information is a copied excerpt from the following source:

<http://www.harzing.com/resources/journal-quality-list>

The Harzing Journal Quality List (JQL) is a collation of journal rankings from a variety of sources. It is published primarily to assist academics to target papers at journals of an appropriate standard. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the Journal Quality List, we recommend that it be checked before used extensively for evaluation purposes. The editor will not be held responsible for omissions or errors. The current version of the JQL contains 18 different rankings of more than 900 journals.

Compiled and edited by Prof. Anne-Wil Harzing

Indicators: Journal Quality List (JQL)

The Journal Quality List comprises academic journals in the following broad areas: Economics, Finance, Accounting, Management, and Marketing. Where available, the rankings for each journal from the following sources are included:

- Erasmus Research Institute of Management Journals Listing 2016
- ESSEC Business School Paris 2016
- Verband der Hochschullehrer für Betriebswirtschaft 2015
- Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 2015
- British Association of Business Schools (ABS) Ranking 2015
- FNEGE (Foundation National pour l'Enseignement de la Gestion des Entreprises)
- Australian Business Deans Council 2013
- Cranfield University School of Management 2012
- AERES (Agence d'évaluation de la recherche et de l'enseignement supérieur) 2012
- University of Queensland 2011 (combined UQ and ERA ranking)
- HEC Paris 2011
- Danish Ministry ranking 2011
- Financial Times 45 Ranking 2010
- Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien 2008
- Aston University 2008
- University of Queensland 2007
- European Journal of Information Systems 2007 (with and without CI)

Note: *The editor regrets to inform users of the Journal Quality List that Thomson Scientific Inc. have requested removal of the Journal Impact Factor scores from the JQL. Please destroy any previous versions of the JQL in your possession. Thomson Scientific Inc. remind academics and universities that they do not permit any republication or re-use of their Impact Factor lists.*

Methodology: (This information from: <http://www.harzing.com/resources/journal-quality-list/frequently-asked-questions>). The JQL is a collation of published lists or journal ranking lists from various universities. Harzing does not personally have any influence or input on the inclusion of individual journals. All the lists in JQL are based on the opinions of a wide range of experts.

How to access:

- JQL by title (http://www.harzing.com/download/jql_journal.pdf)
- JQL by subject area (http://www.harzing.com/download/jql_subject.pdf)
- JQL by ISSN (http://www.harzing.com/download/jql_issn.pdf)

Journal Citation Reports (JCR)

Note: This information is a copied excerpt from the following source:

<http://thomsonreuters.com/en/products-services/scholarly-scientific-research/research-management-and-evaluation/journal-citation-reports.html>

Journal Citation Reports® offers a systematic, objective means to critically evaluate the world's leading journals, with quantifiable, statistical information based on citation data. By compiling articles' cited references, JCR helps to measure research influence and impact at the journal and category levels, and shows the relationship between citing and cited journals. Available in Science and Social Sciences editions.

Created by: Thomson Reuters

Annual Publication

Key Indicators:

- **Total Cites:** the total number of times that each journal has been cited by all journals included in the database within the current JCR year.
- **Impact Factor:** the frequency with which an average article from a journal is cited in a particular year. You can use this number to evaluate or compare a journal's relative importance to others in the same field or see how frequently articles are cited to determine which journals may be better for your collection.
- **Five-Year Impact Factor:** the average number of times articles from the journal published in the last five years have been cited in the JCR year. This metric can be used to better gauge the impact of journals in fields where the influence of published research evolves over a longer period of time.
- **Immediacy Index:** measures how frequently the average article from a journal is cited within the same year as publication. This number is useful for evaluating journals that publish cutting-edge research.
- **Cited Half-Life:** benchmarks the age of cited articles by showing the number of years back from the current year that account for 50% of the total number of citations to a journal in the current year. This number is useful in making collection management and archiving decisions. A publisher may use this number to adjust editorial policies to compete in different market segments.
- **Citable Items:** the number of items considered in the denominator of the Impact Factor calculation. Document types considered citable are Articles and Reviews. Editorials, news items, and similar content are excluded from the denominator, but can contribute citations to the numerator.
- **JIF (Journal Impact Factor) Percentile:** The journal's rank in category, determined by Impact Factor, expressed as a percentile. For example, a journal with a JIF percentile of 89 performs better than 89% of journals in that category.
- **Eigenfactor® Metrics:** are based on the JCR-cited journal data and consider not only the counts of citations a journal receives but also the structure of the citation network as a whole to measure citation influence in the scholarly literature. These metrics are available for JCR year 2007 and later.

Methodology¹:

¹ A note about impact factors (regardless of publisher): No metric will be perfect, and there are critiques about almost every type of indicator. In terms of impact factors – certain editorial practices, for instance, can artificially inflate impact factor calculations. Although it's a Wiki article, here is a decent overview of some of the common criticisms: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impact_factor

From the publisher: JCR uses a combination of impact and influence metrics, and millions of cited and citing journal data points that comprise the complete journal citation network. JCR summarizes citations from science and social science journals and proceedings in the Web of Science database, delivering detailed reports of their citation performance, their citation network, and the count and type of materials published.

How to access:

- Access <http://libguides.usask.ca/az.php?a=w>
- Click on: **Web of Science Core Collection**
- Log in with your UofS information
- Once, redirected to Web of Science, click on **Journal Citation Reports** (top of page).

Learn more: http://wokinfo.com/training_support/training/journal-citation-reports/?utm_source=false&utm_medium=false&utm_campaign=false

FT-50 (previously FT-45)

Note: This information is a copied excerpt from the following source:

<https://www.ft.com/content/3405a512-5cbb-11e1-8f1f-00144feabdc0#axzz20X2NFZRJ>

The *Financial Times* (FT-50) ranks 50 business journals as the top journals in the field of business. In May 2016, the Financial Times conducted a review of the journals that count towards its research rank. As a result, the number of journals considered went up to 50 compared to 45 previously.

Created by: Financial Times

Indicators: FT-50 List

Methodology: In May 2016, over 200 schools were invited to submit up to five new journals to include and five journals to exclude from the previous list. A total of 140 schools submitted their votes, a response rate of 67 per cent. Out of the 10 selected journals up for review, we decided to drop the four journals that each received 60 per cent or more of the votes: Academy of Management Perspectives, California Management Review, Journal of the American Statistical Association and RAND Journal of Economics. Out of the 150 new journals suggested, the nine journals with the most votes were added to the list.

How to access: <https://www.ft.com/content/3405a512-5cbb-11e1-8f1f-00144feabdc0>

Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI)

Note: This information is a copied excerpt from the following source:

<http://thomsonreuters.com/en/products-services/scholarly-scientific-research/scholarly-search-and-discovery/social-sciences-citation-index.html>

Social Sciences Citation Index®, provides quick, access to the bibliographic and citation information needed to find research data, analyze trends, journals and researchers, and share their findings. The Index provides essential data from 3,000 of the world's leading social sciences journals across 50 disciplines.

Created by: Thomson Reuters

Updated Weekly

Indicators: Social Sciences Citation Index

How to access: <http://ip-science.thomsonreuters.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jloptions.cgi?PC=SS>

Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI)

Note: This information is a copied excerpt from the following source:

http://wokinfo.com/products_tools/multidisciplinary/esci/

Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI) expands the citation universe and reflects the growing global body of science and scholarly activity. ESCI complements the highly selective indexes by providing earlier visibility for sources under evaluation as part of SCIE, SSCI, and AHCI's rigorous journal selection process. Inclusion in ESCI provides greater discoverability which leads to measurable citations and more transparency in the selection process.

Created by: Thomson Reuters

Indicator: Emerging Sources Citation Index

Criteria: (This information from: <http://editorresources.taylorandfrancisgroup.com/what-is-the-emerging-sources-citation-index/>). The selection process for ESCI is the first step in applying to the Science Citation Index, Social Science Citation Index and Arts and Humanities Citation Index. Journals accepted for coverage in ESCI must be peer reviewed, follow ethical publishing practices, meet technical requirements, have English language bibliographic information, and be recommended or requested by a scholarly audience of Web of Science users.

How to access: <http://ip-science.thomsonreuters.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jloptions.cgi?PC=EX>

Cabell's Contextual Influence (CCI)

Note: This information is a copied excerpt from the following source:

<https://www.cabells.com/metrics>

Cabell's CCI[®] is a unique way to look at journal quality that considers disciplinary perspectives in assessing journal influence. The reality of journal evaluation is that research is increasingly cross-disciplinary and, accordingly, an individual journal might publish articles relevant to several fields. As such, researchers in different fields often use and value the same journal differently. For example, a top journal in computer science might sometimes publish articles about educational technology, but researchers in educational technology might not really "care" about this journal the same way that computer scientists do. Conversely, top educational technology journals likely publish some articles about computer science, but these journals are not necessarily as highly regarded by the computer science community.

CCI[®] is a contextual citation metric that ranks journals within each of the disciplines and topics in which it publishes. This means that a journal that publishes in both computer science and educational technology will have an influence classification for each of those two disciplines. Further, within each discipline, the CCI[®] classifies a journal's influence for each topic that it covers. This gives researchers and tenure committees a way to evaluate not just how influential a journal is, but also the degree to which a journal influences different disciplines. Researchers, librarians, and tenure committees all use the CCI[®] to better understand how academic journals align with their objectives.

Created by: Cabell's International

Indicators:

- **Journal Citation Reports (JCR)**
- **Cabell's Influence Classifications:** approximate the top 10% (Premier), 11-20% (Significant), and >20% (High).

Methodology: To generate the CCI[®], we calculate the average citations per article for each journal from the preceding 3-year period, then put each journal into a z-score transformed distribution for each discipline and topic. This yields, for each discipline and topic that any journal publishes in, an individual ranking environment that consists only of the titles that publish therein. From there, we use the distribution to categorize each of the journals within each environment into one of three influence classifications that approximate the top 10% (Premier), 11-20% (Significant), and >20% (High). Because journals must achieve a certain threshold for citation activity to be included in the underlying citation database, any journal ranked by the CCI[®] is considered to exhibit a relatively high level of influence.

How to access:

- Visit <http://libguides.usask.ca/az.php?a=c>
- Select **Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities**
- Log-in with your UofS credentials

Misleading Metrics

A new list created by Jeffrey Beall (see “Beall’s List” section below) offers “list of questionable companies that purport to provide valid scholarly metrics at the researcher, article, or journal level.” These would generally *not* be recommended as trustworthy sources of information about journal quality or research impact:

Created by: Jeffrey Beall

How to access: <https://scholarlyoa.com/other-pages/misleading-metrics/>

Predatory Journals

[Predatory open access \(OA\) publishing](#) is an “exploitative open-access publishing business model that involves charging publication fees to authors without providing the editorial and publishing services associated with legitimate journals (open access or not)”. These outlets are profit-driven rather than based on rigorous research/knowledge dissemination; they are typically low quality, with questionable (or absent) peer-review practices ([Berger & Cirasella, 2015](#)).

It’s important to note that many legitimate and high-quality journals also charge publishing fees, so fees alone are not an indicator of predatory publishing practices—in some disciplines, publishing fees are the norm. Another consideration is that simply being ‘subscription-based’ (i.e., not open-access) does not make a journal any more reputable *per se*. The existence of low quality/questionable outlets happened long before open-access or online journals were developed—but OA platforms have enabled these practices to increase exponentially.

Predatory publishing is becoming an increasingly urgent concern in academia, and the publication volumes in such sources are rapidly expanding ([Shen & Bjork, 2015](#); and see their article for some fairly alarming statistics).

In May 2016, Edwards faculty council passed a motion to disallow publications in predatory journals in collegial process considerations (see Appendix A, and a policy was developed in December 2016 (see Appendix B). It is important to be vigilant in protecting your scholarly work. Here are some resources that can help.

Best Practices for Choosing Quality Research Dissemination Outlets

Consistent with the Edwards School of Business policy, at the time of manuscript submission, author(s) should establish a case for journal/publisher legitimacy by documenting evidence throughout the review/publication process. These sources of evidence about legitimacy and journal quality could also be assessed for all potential publishers/journals in order to find quality outlets in which to submit one’s work (i.e., to find an appropriate outlet, not only to avoid predatory publishers). Best practices include:

- journal appears on accepted ratings or rankings lists;
- journal adheres to appropriate Editorial and peer review practices;
- communication (e.g., email) with Editorial team demonstrates appropriate timeframes and peer-review processes;
- the Editorial Board is comprised of reputable scholars;
- journal affiliation with a recognized scholarly or professional association;
- journal/publisher does not appear on Beall’s List.

Beall’s List

What is Beall’s List?

Librarian Jeffrey Beall researches and publishes a list of what he terms “*potential, possible, or probable predatory scholarly open-access publishers*.” This is arguably one of the best-known resources for helping to identify predatory journals and predatory publishers. Beall has been praised worldwide for his work, but it’s important to note that his list and inclusion criteria are not without their critics. Some have argued that the list is biased against outlets from less-developed countries, that the criteria are ambiguous, or that Beall lacks disciplinary knowledge of many of the journals². Nonetheless, it is perhaps one of the best sources of information to protect

² I got this information from the Wiki page https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Predatory_open_access_publishing, but here are the original sources that are listed for critiques of Beall’s List:

- Bivens-Tatum, W. (2014). “[Reactionary Rhetoric Against Open Access Publishing](#)”. *tripleC*. 12 (2): 441–446.

scholars from disreputable publishers/journals. Collegial process committees at the U of S use this list, as do reviewers for AACSB Accreditation.

Criteria for determining predatory open-access publishers (Jan 1, 2015)

Available at: <https://scholarlyoa.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/criteria-2015.pdf>

The criteria are divided into the following categories:

- Editor and staff
- Business management
- Integrity
- Other
- Poor journal standards/practice

How to access:

Beall offers lists of predatory publishers and journals, as well as misleading metrics and hijacked journals. You can access all the lists from this page:

<https://scholarlyoa.com/2016/01/05/bealls-list-of-predatory-publishers-2016/>

Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)

Note: This information is a copied excerpt from the following source: <https://doaj.org>

What is the DOAJ?

DOAJ is a community-curated online directory that indexes and provides access to high quality, open access, peer-reviewed journals. The Directory of Open Access Journals was launched in 2003 at Lund University, Sweden, with 300 open access journals and today contains ca. 9000 open access journals covering all areas of science, technology, medicine, social science and humanities. To assist libraries and indexers keep their lists up-to-date, a public list of journals that have been accepted into or removed from DOAJ is provided. DOAJ does not discuss individual publishers or applications with members of the public unless the group believes that, by doing so, they will be making a positive contribution to the open access community.

Who creates or contributes the information?

DOAJ uses the services of approximately 100 voluntary editorial staff who review applications. Volunteers are bound by a Code of Conduct and an Agreement that they must sign and return to DOAJ before they can carry out their duties. At least two references are requested from everyone who volunteers and all volunteers are bound by the Code of Conduct to declare any conflicts of interest to the Managing Editors.

What are the inclusion criteria?

To be included in DOAJ, journals must follow publishing best practices and basic inclusion standards, such as:

- The full text of ALL content must be available for free and be Open Access without delay (i.e. no embargo period).
- Journals must have its own dedicated website. No other service or product should be present under that URL. All the journal content that the publisher is including in the

-
- Berger, M. & Cirasella, J. (March 2015). *"Beyond Beall's List"*. *College & Research Libraries News*. pp. 132–135.
 - Coyle, K. (April 4, 2013). *"Predatory Publishers – Peer to Peer Review"*. *Library Journal*.
 - Murray-Rust, P. (February 18, 2014). *"Beall's criticism of MDPI lacks evidence and is irresponsible"*. *petermr's blog*.

application must be in one place and not spread over various locations. This includes archive material.

- All the necessary journal business information pages (by 'business information pages', we mean the journal's aims and scope, the editorial board, the instructions for authors, the description of the quality control system, the Open Access statement, the plagiarism policy, and the licensing terms) must be hosted on this same site and not be held centrally on another web site, or must be prominently linked to from the journal's homepage.
- A journal must have at least one ISSN (International Standard Serial Number) registered at issn.org.
- Journals must contain clear navigation with links to a Current Issue, the Archive or Past Issues, Search, Browse, the About page, the Editorial Board and Contact Us.
- A link to the Editorial Board must be displayed prominently on the journal's home page. The following information must be made available on the Editorial Board page: the name, affiliation and email address of the editor(s); the names of the editorial board members. The page must be up-to-date.
- All articles must go through a quality control system (editorial or peer review) before publication and the exact type of review must be stated clearly on the web site.
- A link to comprehensive guidelines for authors (Instructions for Authors) must be clearly presented on the journal's homepage.
- Every journal must display clearly on its web site information about any charges for an author to process or publish a paper.
- The journal's Open Access policy must be clearly stated on the journal's web site (not the publisher's own site). It should also be linked to from the home page. The full text of the articles of the journal should be freely available without embargo.

What is the DOAJ Seal?

The DOAJ Seal is a mark of certification for open access journals, awarded by DOAJ to journals that achieve a high level of openness, adhere to Best Practice and high publishing standards. To receive the Seal, the journal must comply with the following 7 conditions:

- Use DOIs as permanent identifiers;
- Provides DOAJ with article metadata;
- Deposits content with a long term digital preservation or archiving program;
- Embeds machine-readable CC licensing information in articles;
- Allows generous reuse and mixing of content, in accordance with a CC BY, CC BY-SA or CC BY-NC license;
- Has a deposit policy registered with a deposit policy registry;
- Allows the author to hold the copyright without restrictions.

How to access: <https://doaj.org>

Resources on Journal Ethics

“COPE” – the Committee on Publication Ethics: <http://publicationethics.org/about>

Journal Editor Ethics Code of Conduct Initiative: <https://editorethics.uncc.edu/editor-ethics-2-0-code/>

Appendix A

Motion from Faculty Council on Predatory Journals: May 2016

Excerpt from Edwards School of Business Faculty Council Meeting Minutes:

Predatory Journals and Research Agenda for Non-APA Faculty (attached)

- i. This motion is not stopping faculty from publishing in predatory journals, but journal articles published in predatory journals will be excluded from collegial processes (which will be added to the Standards when they are revised), RBTR, merit and scholar appointments.
- ii. If faculty are innocently caught publishing in a predatory journal, this publication can be removed from your CV. Most predatory journals do not let the faculty member recant from these journals. Faculty members are encouraged to search COPE or Beall's list, discuss journals with colleagues and to investigate unknown journals prior to submitting articles for publication.
- iii. It was asked if there is potential to build a process to report it to an Associate dean or department head. Once an article is accepted and published, it is too late as there are copyright laws.
- iv. CRC is checking published journal articles for collegial processes.

MOTION: That predatory journals be excluded from all collegial process considerations, including, but not limited to renewal, promotion, tenure, merit, RBTR, and scholar appointments.

Appendix B

Edwards School of Business Predatory Journal Policy: December 2016

Policy Title:	Predatory Journals and Predatory Publishers
Associated Standards:	Edwards School of Business Standards for Tenure and Promotion; Departmental and College Standards for Merit Review; Edwards Faculty Qualifications Policy and Hiring Procedures
Effective:	Date of first approval at Faculty Council
Responsible Parties:	This policy will be jointly upheld by Department Heads, Deans, collegial process committees, hiring committees, and scholar appointment committees.

Approved by Executive Committee: Friday, December 9th 2016

Approved by Faculty Council: Friday, December 16th 2016

Purpose

Predatory journals/publishers are becoming an increasingly urgent concern in academia, with some estimates suggesting 420,000 articles published by 8,000 journals in 2014 (Shen & Bjork, 2015). The issue is complex and controversial.

In May 2016, Edwards School of Business passed a motion to disallow publications in predatory outlets (i.e., journals, publishers) from its collegial processes considerations, reflecting a desire to ensure the legitimacy and quality of our research. This policy and its associated procedures were subsequently created in order to fulfill that motion, which reflects the will of the School's collective faculty.

The intent of this policy is to (a) assist researchers at the Edwards School of Business in protecting their work and targeting legitimate scholarly outlets, (b) guide collegial process committees in their decision making, and (c) support the trajectory of the Edwards School of Business in enhancing the quality and impact of our research achievements.

Definitions

Predatory Journals and Publishers

For purposes of this policy, predatory journals and predatory publishers are defined as those presented in the most recently updated Beall's List. While not without its critics, this list is widely accepted as reliably and comprehensively identifying predatory outlets, and it is currently being used by our key stakeholders (e.g., University of Saskatchewan, AACSB).

Beall uses extensive criteria to define what is considered "predatory," including, but not limited to characteristics of the editorial team, false claims about impact or indexing, unethical review practices, republishing papers from other outlets, false identifies, etc. The full criteria are available here: <https://scholarlyoa.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/criteria-2015.pdf>

Collegial Process Considerations

Includes decisions about, but not limited to: renewal, tenure, promotion, salary review/merit, hiring, RBTR, and scholar or other appointments.

Policy

Publications in predatory journals and/or predatory publishers will be excluded from all collegial process considerations, including, but not limited to renewal, promotion, tenure, salary review/merit, hiring, RBTR, and scholar or other appointments.

Procedures

Papers published prior to May 2016

According to the policy, publications in predatory journals or outlets would not be counted for collegial process considerations. Any submissions for collegial process considerations should be separately verified by the candidate and his/her Department Head to ensure the absence of predatory journals/publishers.

However, prior to May 2016, the author(s) may not have been aware of the predatory publishing issue (i.e., prior to the motion passed at Faculty Council). Where such an item is identified, the author(s) may elect to remove these items from their CV, or attempt to establish a case for the article's legitimacy using the procedures outlined below.

Papers published after May 2016

According to the policy, publications in predatory journals or outlets would not be counted for collegial process considerations. Any submissions for collegial process considerations should be separately verified by the candidate and his/her Department Head to ensure the absence of predatory journals/publishers.

However, it should be noted that the journals and publishers on Beall's List (and likewise for nearly all lists and rankings of journal impact or quality) are regularly reviewed and change over time. That is, a journal that is not listed one year may be listed the next year, and vice versa. This can happen for many reasons, including changes in editorial practices or a journal being purchased by a different publisher. Recognizing the challenge this can create for researchers, the following procedures are recommended.

At the time of manuscript submission, author(s) should establish a case for journal/publisher legitimacy by documenting evidence throughout the review/publication process, such as:

- journal/publisher does not appear on Beall's List at the time of submission/publication;
- journal appears on accepted ratings or rankings lists³;
- journal adheres to appropriate Editorial and peer review practices;
- records of communication (e.g., email) with Editorial team that demonstrate appropriate timeframes and peer-review processes;
- the Editorial Board is comprised of reputable scholars;
- journal affiliation with a recognized scholarly or professional association.

In the event that the journal or publisher later appears on Beall's List, or is otherwise deemed to be predatory, the author(s) should submit the documented evidence to the contrary with his/her case or application. That is, the author(s) must demonstrate their due diligence in establishing that, at the time of submission, there was no indication that the journal or publisher was predatory. This evidence should be considered by collegial process committee(s) in their decision, as to whether sufficient evidence is present and an exception can be granted.

References

Shen, C., & Bjork, B.C. (2015). 'Predatory' open access: A longitudinal study of article volumes and market characteristics. *BMC Medicine*, 13:230, 1-15.

³ See Edwards School of Business "Journal Impact Indicators: Quick Reference Guide" for some well-established ratings, rankings, and other indicators of journal quality.