

DILLA UNIVERSITY



Office of Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer

GUIDELINE FOR ASSESSMENT OF PUBLICATIONS SUBMITTED FOR ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS

PREPARED BY:

1. Dr. AsebeRegassa----- Chair person
2. Dr. AmareAregahegn----- Secretary
3. Mr. AbdulmelikHusen----- Member
4. Dr. AshenafiKebede-----Member
5. Mr. AmareTesfaye----- Member
6. Dr. Daniel Gebretsadik----- Member
7. Dr. DejeneTefera----- Member
8. Mr. MulugetaSisay-----Member
9. Mr.YohannesAddisu----- Member

September 2017
Dilla, Ethiopia

This page is deliberately left blank

Contents

ACRONYM	3
Section I: General Provision	4
Introduction	4
1.1 Short Title	5
1.2 Objectives of the Guideline	5
1.3 Definition Terms.....	5
1.4 Scope of Application	6
Section II: Publications for Promotion.....	7
2.1 List of Publications eligible for consideration in promotion.....	7
2.2 Assessment criteria for Publications.....	7
2.2.1. Mandatory Conditions for Publications Suspected of Falling into the List of Predatory Journals/Publications.....	7
2.2.2. General Criteria for Assessments of Journals	10
2.2.3. Criteria for Assessment of papers published in Conference/Research Proceedings.....	10
2.2.4. Criteria for Assessments of Text Book	11
2.2.5. Criteria for Assessments of Books	12
2.2.6. Criteria for Assessments of Books Chapters.....	12
2.2.7. Criteria for Assessments of Teaching Materials/Modules (applicable only if it is incorporated and approved in the revised legislation)	13
2.2.8. Criteria for Assessments of Technical Notes, Case report, Discussion	13
2.2.9. Criteria for Assessments of Short brief/Communication.....	14
2.3 Quantitative Evaluation of Journal Articles, Review Papers	14
Section III. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.....	19
1.1 Obligation to comply and right to appeal.....	19
3.2 Inapplicable Laws	19
3.3 Amendment	19
3.4 Effective date and Notification	19
Appendices.....	20

ACRONYM

DU	Dilla University
VPRTT	Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer
DC	Department Council
SC	School Council
AC	College Academic Council
RDO	Research and Dissemination Office
RDC	Research and Dissemination Committee

Section I: General Provision

Introduction

As part of its missions, Dilla University (here after DU) has the responsibility to undertake and support research activities on topics pertaining to societal problems, policy issues and global knowledge production. While conducting scientific research is a fundamental milestone in the process, disseminating research outputs becomes an equally important step for meaningful contribution of the research exercise. To this goal, DU is supporting, funding and promoting multidimensional themes of research. All academic staff of the university have the obligation to conduct research and disseminate their research output through different strategies of which publication in different forms and technology release to solve problems remain prevalent. More importantly, publication has remained to be one of the common strategies/channels of disseminating and communicating scientific findings to academic community, policy makers, the media, practitioners and other broader audience.

According to the Dilla University Senate Legislation (2012, Article 54:4.4), any promotion to the rank of assistant professor and above should meet different requirements of scientific publications. However, the Legislation leaves out detail description on standard and reputability of publications for further guideline to be developed. In Article 54 (4.4.b) the Legislation states, “The reputability of journals shall be determined by the academic unit and approved by the University’s Research and Development Committee”. Although the legislation clearly states that research articles should be published in reputable journals to be considered for promotion, the qualitative descriptions of reputability are still vague and it is open for possibilities of different interpretations and subjectivities. Therefore, it has become necessary to develop a guideline to ease assessment of any publication submitted by academic staff for the purpose of promotion. To this end, a guideline, namely, “Publications Assessment Guideline for Promotion, 2016” was developed and approved by Dilla University Senate in July 2016.

However, after few months of practice, the Senate has realized that the guideline had different limitations. As a result, the Senate suggested the revision of the previous guideline, which has led to current guideline but with extensive changes and improvements. For the purpose of developing this guideline, the team used guidelines from Addis Ababa University, Bahir

DarUniversity, Gondar University, Haramaya University, and Mekele University. Moreover, Dilla University's Legislation has been used as reference to maintain compatibility of the guideline to different provisions in the legislation. In addition, the team has explored international journals and their guidelines to adapt to our context.

1.1 Short Title

This document may be cited as "The Revised Guideline for Assessment of Publications Submitted for Promotions, 2017".

1.2 Objectives of the Guideline

The objectives of this Guideline are to:

- 1) Establish clear and valid assessment criteria for the evaluation of publications submitted for promotion;
- 2) Minimize or even avoid the subjectivity of the criteria of promotion identified in the university senate legislation;
- 3) Avoid possible confusions among researchers and decision makers in the determination of acceptable publications; and
- 4) Avoid future controversies/disagreements in relation to the identification of acceptable publications for promotion including their values.
- 5) Encourage and support researchers to identify reputable journals and publish their research outcomes in such journals.

1.3 Definition Terms

In this guideline, unless the context requires otherwise:

1. "Board" shall mean the administrative board of any public University in Ethiopia
2. "Consistency of the Journal" shall mean the publication of each issue per volume or each volume per year as per the frequency stated in the journal website.
3. "Continuity of the Journal" shall mean the continuous publication of the journal uninterrupted or not discontinued.

4. “Journal article” shall mean scientific papers published in journals passing through peer-review processes.
5. “Indexation” shall mean the registration of the journal in scientific abstracting and indexing databases.
6. “Maturity of the Journal” shall mean the age of the journal since its establishment, and this can be evaluated in terms of its volume.
7. “Peer-review” shall mean the blind professional assessment of a research manuscript by anonymous reviewer(s) before the acceptance of the manuscript for publication.
8. “Publication” shall mean published scholarly writings in journals and proceedings as well as textbooks, books, book chapters, and teaching materials.
9. “Promotion” shall mean academic promotion to the ranks of lecturer and above requested by any academic staff of Dilla University as per the University Legislation.
10. “Plagiarism” shall mean the practice of copying ideas, texts, data and other creative work and presenting it as original result of own research work, without proper citation.
11. “Proceedings” shall mean collection of papers presented on national/international conferences/symposia/seminars and are published after being peer-reviewed. It also refers to research proceeding(s) whereby an institution publishes research works as “research proceeding(s).
12. “Reputability” shall mean the acceptability of the publication based on the criteria set for its assessment by this guideline.
13. “Self-plagiarism” shall mean duplicating one’s own work in another publication or publishing one’s own already published work without significant revision.
14. . “Short communication” shall mean brief notes produced from scientific works
15. “Standard Publisher” shall mean an academic publisher that meets the standard profiles of publication as indicated in appendix II of this guideline.

1.4 Scope of Application

This guideline is applicable for assessment of publications submitted for promotion as per the University Senate Legislation. It will be used for assessment of any publication

submitted as requirement(s) of promotion to the ranks of Lecturer and above as per the provisions in the revised Dilla University Legislation, 2012.

Section II: Publications for Promotion

2.1 List of Publications eligible for consideration in promotion

- a) Research Articles published in reputable journals
- b) Review Papers published in reputable journals
- c) Papers published in Conference Proceedings
- d) Textbooks
- e) Books based on original research
- f) Papers published as book chapters
- g) Teaching Materials/Modules
- h) Technical Notes, Case Reports, Discussions
- i) Short/Brief Communication

2.2 Assessment criteria for Publications

2.2.1. Mandatory Conditions for Publications Suspected of Falling into the List of Predatory Journals/Publications

2.2.1.1. Free from publication in standalone/Predatory journals

In this era of communication technology, the scientific community, scientific publishers and journals exist within the ambivalence of exploiting the opportunities generated from communication technologies, on the one hand, and the challenge of facing publication platforms that do not follow standard scientific publication processes. The publication platforms that do not meet standard scientific publication procedures and ethics are called *predatory/standalone* journals or publishers. These predatory/standalone journals/publishers are mainly business-oriented in their publication activities and fail to conduct scientific review of manuscripts, they do not have sound editorial policy and neither their editorial board nor the advisory board

members qualify to manage journals that are presumably portrayed as high standard and broader in scope. The following criteria shall be used to distinguish predatory journals/publishers, and if a journal matches with three or more of the criteria listed below, it will automatically be rejected from consideration for further assessment:

- a) The publisher's owner is identified as the editor of many of the journals published by the organization
- b) No or inadequate information about institutional affiliation and academic profile is provided regarding the editor and editorial staff.
- c) Evidence exists showing editor-in-chief or other editorial board members do not have the relevant qualification and academic expertise to reasonably qualify them to be publication gatekeepers in the journal's field.
- d) Two or more journals have duplicate board members,
- e) The name of the journal is incongruent with the journal's mission
- f) The publisher publishes journals that are excessively broad (e.g. Journal of Education, Journal of Science, Journal of Current Research etc),
- g) The publisher publishes journals that combine two or more fields not normally treated together (e.g. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*),
- h) The publisher does not use standard identifiers such as ISSN or DOI or uses them improperly,
- i) Evidence exists that showing that the publisher/journal does not really conduct proper peer-review although it claims to do so,
- j) The publisher or its journals are not listed in standard periodical directories or are not widely catalogued in library databases,
- k) The Journal/publisher copies or mimics from other high-quality journals/publishers,
- l) None of the members of the journal's editorial board have ever published an article in the journal
- m) The journal is found in the list of standalone journals.

In general, all journals will be first checked if they appear in world-class publishers and indexation databases listed under Appendix I and II. If the journals are not found in the lists of publishers and databases, the journals will be checked if they fall into Jeffrey Beall's

standalone/predatory journals/publishers updated version. The Beall's list will be updated every year by the RDO. If the journal is listed in Beall's predatory list, the publication shall be automatically rejected, and will not proceed to any further process of assessment. However, in case if the journals are found both in the renowned databases and at the same time in the list of predatory journals, the committee shall request the applicant to submit evidence of peer-review of the manuscript as detailed under 2.2.1.2 of this guideline.

2.2.1.2. Evidence of peer-review

Any paper published in proceedings, books, and journals or as short/brief communication, and technical notes, case reports and discussion papers should provide clear evidence of peer-review before publication. For article, book, book chapters and proceedings, there should be clear evidence of correspondence demonstrating detail peer-review comments from reviewers to authors via editors, and the applicant should submit such evidence upon request by the committee. Whereas, in the case of short/brief communication, and technical notes, case reports and discussion papers, evidence from editor of the publication platforms can be provided as proof for the papers' review process. Note that, a manuscript is said to be peer reviewed if and only if the number of referees per manuscript are two or more in the case of article papers.

2.2.1.3. Free from all kinds of Plagiarism

While there are many types of plagiarism such as intentional, unintentional and self-plagiarism, it is the responsibility of the researcher to avoid all types of plagiarism, as any kind of such practice is deemed unethical and results in disqualification of the paper as per the detail set in this guideline. For any publication to be eligible and to enter into the process of evaluation for reputability assessment, it should be cleared from any kind of plagiarism. Clearance from plagiarism should be made through the following steps:

- ✚ Self-Plagiarism: Cases of self-plagiarism occur in the form of re-publication of one's own already published material without significant modification and copying from one's own published work without proper citation. With considerable modifications, an author may use up to 50% of his/her own work from thesis or dissertation.

- ✚ Other forms of Plagiarism: Whether it is intentional or unintentional, plagiarism is considered as academic crime. Because it is not easy to distinguish intentional plagiarism from unintentional act of same practice, any paper that shows any kind of plagiarism shall not be eligible for assessment in the promotion application.

2.2.2. General Criteria for Assessments of Journals

1. Evidence of peer-review of the article
2. Free from any kind of plagiarism
3. Not in the list of standalone journals
4. Sound editorial policy of the journal
 - ✚ Offers a viable editorial policy and clear guidelines for authors and reviewers,
5. Professional reputation of editorial board and advisory board members
 - ✚ Has an editor-in-chief, a managing editor, and/or associate editors,
6. Regularity/Consistence and Continuity of the journal
7. Publisher standard (listed under appendix I of this guideline, and should be updated every six months by RDO and approved by RDC).
8. Indexation(listed under appendix II of this guideline, and should be updated every six months by RDO and approved by RDC).

While the details of the criteria listed above from 1-3 have been described under section 1.5 in this guideline, the detail explanation and values given to the items listed under 4-8 are well described below under section 2.3 of this guideline.

2.2.3. Criteria for Assessment of papers published in Conference/Research Proceedings

Papers published in conference or research proceedings shall be evaluated by three (two external and one internal) anonymouswell-qualified researchers who are in the academic rank or above the academic rank for which the promotion is requested.In the review by the three reviewers, the paper should fulfil the following requirements:

- a) There is a statement in the proceedings that all papers are peer-reviewed in full after presentation
- b) The author has a statement or acknowledgement from the proceedings editor(s) showing

- that all papers are peer-reviewed in full
- c) The author has a copy of the reviewer's assessment relating to the paper
2. Contributions drawn from presentations on national/international conference with related theme/panel to the contribution, and
 3. The selection process is on competitive basis.

2.2.4. Criteria for Assessments of Text Book

To qualify as a textbook a manuscript must:

- a) Have at least 80% coverage of the subject;
- b) Include current views in the field whether controversial or settled;
- c) Have a practical approach to the subject dealt with
- d) Be prepared in as simple and comprehensive manner as possible taking into consideration the level of understanding of its primary audiences;
- e) Comply with the rules, procedures and ethics of academic research and publication;
- f) Include all tabulations, graphs, illustrations and exercises where necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter it deals with;
- g) Meet the existing situation of Ethiopia and be compatible with other available materials;
- h) Be prepared by staff member with the rank of lecturer and above who has effectively taught the course at least 2 times in different semesters; and the material should be within the field of specialization of the writer.
- i) Must be positively assessed and accepted by one internal and two external assessors.
- j) When the author has used a teaching material or module for a previous promotion and developed it into a textbook thereafter, the work will receive 50% of the points for a textbook, i.e., 100 points. However, in such case, the teaching textbook should demonstrate at least 25% additional new work different from the modules/teaching materials previously used.
- k) Sufficient instructional strategies are provided to promote depth of understanding
- l) The textbook should be published by a reputable academic publisher

2.2.5. Criteria for Assessments of Books

- a) Prepared based on original research on the subject
- b) 50% of each chapter is composed of original data
- c) Meet generally accepted standard profile of books (index, references, ISBN, Barcode identification, and cataloguing information)
- d) Be prepared by staff member with the rank of lecturer and above whose area of specialization is related to the book under consideration.
- e) Be positively reviewed and accepted by two external and one internal assessors where the internal assessor is at least equivalent or higher rank to the applicant and the external assessors must be with higher rank.

When the author has used teaching material, module or textbooks for previous promotion and developed it into a book thereafter, the book will receive 50% of the points for a book, i.e. 150 points. However, the author should demonstrate at least over 25% new data and theoretical improvements.

2.2.6. Criteria for Assessments of Books Chapters

- a) Prepared based on original research on the subject (substantive data/method), and
- b) The edited book is published by reputable publisher or the book/book chapter meets generally accepted profile of book,

OR

- c. Prepared based on original research on the subject (substantive data/method), and
- d. The book should be edited by specialist(s) in the field
- e. The specific chapter reviewed before publication
- f. The chapter fits to the overall themes of the edited book volume
- g. The editor(s) of the book should be having academic levels of Assistant Professor and above

When the author has used the teaching material, module or textbooks for a previous promotion and developed it into a book thereafter, the work will receive 50% of the points for a book, i.e.,

150 points. However, the book should not use more than 75% from the materials previously used for promotion.

2.2.7. Criteria for Assessments of Teaching Materials/Modules (applicable only if it is incorporated and approved in the revised legislation)

- 1) To qualify as a teaching material/module a manuscript must:
 - a) Have at least 90% coverage of the course for which it is prepared;
 - b) Include current views in the field whether controversial or settled;
 - c) Have a practical approach to the subject dealt with;
 - d) Be prepared in as simple and comprehensive manner as possible taking into consideration the level of understanding of its primary audiences;
 - e) Comply with the rules, procedures and ethics of academic research and publication;
 - f) Include all tabulations, graphs, illustrations and exercises where necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter it deals with;
 - g) Meet the existing situation of Ethiopia and be compatible with other available materials;
 - h) Be prepared by an academic staff member who has at least a rank of lecturer and one year of effective teaching experience, provided that the teaching material in question is in the area of the specialty of the staff; and
 - i) Be positively reviewed by one internal and one external assessor.
 - j) The course objectives, descriptions and outline are congruent with the department curricula and confirmed by the department
 - k) Clear and adequate instructional strategies

2.2.8. Criteria for Assessments of Technical Notes, Case report, Discussion

Case reports:

- a. Novelty (originality) of the case and of the evaluation
- b. Confirmation/evidence of ethical clearance and of conflict of interest
- c. Should be published in reputable journal passing through peer-review process
- d. Practicality and contribution to the field

2.2.9. Criteria for Assessments of Short brief/Communication

For short/brief communication to be qualified for promotion, it should fulfill the following criteria:

- a) Provide concise review and findings on the area
- b) Draw the brief communication on academic analysis (review of existing work or based on empirical data)
- c) Provide clear policy guideline targeting specific institution
- d) The brief communication should be published on scientific website, journal, bulletin or magazine
- e) The brief communication or policy brief note should be reviewed before publication and evidence of review should be submitted with the application

2.3 Quantitative Evaluation of Journal Articles, Review Papers

No .	General criteria	Interpretation	Specific criteria	Values
1.	The professional reputation and competence of editors, board of advisors, editorial staff	This criterion tries to evaluate the academic and publication profile of editor-in-chief, editorial board, number and composition of advisory board	Academic and publication profile of editors, editorial board members and, composition of advisory board	25
			a. Academic profile of the editor-in-chief	3
			• Masters degree	0
			• PhD	3
			b. Academic profile of editorial board members	3
			• Masters degree	1
			• PhD	3
			• Combination of both	2
			c. Publication profile of the editor-in-chief	10
			• Less than 2 articles	0

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 to 3 articles 	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 to 5 articles; 	5
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 to 10 articles; 	7
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11 and above articles 	10
			d. Average Value for Publication profile of each editorial board members	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 2 	0
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-4 articles 	1
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-8 articles 	2
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 and above articles 	3
			e. Affiliation of Board Members	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universities 	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Institutions 	2
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universities and Research Institutions 	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-academic organizations 	0
			f. Composition of advisory board members	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No international composition 	0

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 25% international composition 	2
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25% and above 	3
2.	Sound editorial Policy	This criterion evaluates that the journal has acceptable and clear editorial policy	Ethical issues, author guidelines, description of scope and focus, accessibility policy and standard of publishers	25
			a. Ethical Issues/Plagiarism policy	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, 	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, 	0
			b. Submission guideline	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email 	2
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online 	3
			c. Manuscript preparation guideline	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes 	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No 	0
			d. Description of scope and focus	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journal theme specific 	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 	2
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrelated to the journal theme 	0
			e. Accessibility of the policy	3
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes 	3

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No 	0
			f. Publisher standard	10
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fixed location and address 	2
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, 	2
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. 	0
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established publishers listed under Appendix I of this guideline 	8
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Other publishers 	5
3.	Permanenceo f the Journal	This criterion evaluates the maturity, consistence and continuity of a journal	Consistence, continuity and maturity of the journal	15
			a. Volume	10
			1. Volume Number 1-3	3
			2. Volume number 4 to 5	6
			3. Volume number 6-8	9
			4. Volume number 9 and above	10
			b. Consistence and Continuity	5
			1. Consistency	2
			i. Consistent	2
			ii. Inconsistent	1

			2. Continuity	3
			i. Continuing	3
			ii. Interrupted but continuing	2
			iii. Discontinued	1
4	The backing and respect given on the journal	This criterion refers to the assessment given on the journal by senior professionals within the respective department/institute/center/school of the applicant (within the university or in a different university)	Recognition and assessment given to the journal by senior professionals within the respective department/institute/center/school of the applicant (based on the report of the team established by RDC)	10
			i. Highly recognized	10
			ii. Recognized	6
			iii. Moderate	3
			iv. Not recognized	0
5.	Indexed Journal	This criterion requires that the journal has been registered in scientifically acceptable journal indexing and abstracting databases.	Indexation/ISSN/Board/Senate approval	25
			a. Indexation in one of the identified and recognized databases listed under Appendix II of this guideline	25
			b. Indexation in unidentified database under Appendix II of this guideline and not in the predatory indexing databases	20
			c. Not indexed at all	0

		ISSN/Board/Senate approval	i. ISSN/DOI	5
			Yes,	5
			No,	0
			ii. Senate/Board approval	20

Based on the above calculation, publications that rank greater or equal to 70 will be considered to be reputable.

Section III. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

1.1 Obligation to comply and right to appeal

All departments, other academic and administrative units, and staff members of the University's community shall have duty to observe and implement the provisions of these Guidelines.

3.2 Inapplicable Laws

No guideline or customary practice may, in so far as it is inconsistent with the provisions of this guideline, be applicable with respect to matters covered under this guideline.

3.3 Amendment

Amendment is possible to this guideline provided that it is supported by the majority of the Senate members.

3.4 Effective date and Notification

- 1) This Guideline shall enter into force up on the date of approval by the University Senate.
- 2) The VPRTT Office shall notify this guideline to all concerned bodies up on approval by the University Senate.

Appendices

Appendix I

List of standard Publishers

- ✚ Springer,
- ✚ Elsevier,
- ✚ SAGE Publications
- ✚ Cambridge University press,
- ✚ Oxford University press,
- ✚ MIT press,
- ✚ U of Chicago press,
- ✚ Macmillan,
- ✚ Wiley,
- ✚ Taylor& Francis,
- ✚ Routledge
- ✚ Frontiers
- ✚ RSC
- ✚ ACS (American Chemical Society)
- ✚ Emerald,
- ✚ JSTOR
- ✚ Addis Ababa University press,
- ✚ Other University affiliated press

- ✚ Publications in a local (Ethiopian academic journals) may be recognized as a legitimate publication, if the journal complies with standards of peer review. This is meant to encourage the culture of academic publication both in Dilla University and nationally. For this purpose, the applicant should provide the evidence of peer-review as stated in this guideline.

Appendix II

List of World Class Scientific Databases

- ✚ Scopus,
- ✚ Thomson Reuters,
- ✚ COPE,
- ✚ Linguistics abstract,
- ✚ MLA international,
- ✚ CAB international,
- ✚ Bibliography,
- ✚ Ecology Abstracts
- ✚ SCimago,
- ✚ British Education Index,
- ✚ Science Citation Index
- ✚ Science Direct
- ✚ African Journals Online (AJOL)
- ✚ IEEE
- ✚ Social Science Abstract,
- ✚ Social Sciences Citation Index
- ✚ EBSCOhost,
- ✚ PubMed
- ✚ ATLA religion database (<http://www.atla.com/>)
- ✚ Religious and Theological abstracts (<http://rtabstracts.org/>)
- ✚ Wiley Online Library
- ✚ ProQuest
- ✚ Sage Journals
- ✚ Science Citation Index Expanded (Web of Science)
- ✚ Arts and Humanities Citation Index
- ✚ ACS (American Chemical Society)
- ✚ SpringerLink