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General

• Steps we followed
  – Vice President for Research and Community service distributed the EAS documents to the five JU hosted Journal EICs
  – All the JU hosted journal EICs went through the document ahead of time
  – A half day discussion on the initiative was undertaken
  – The Vice president and all the EICs appreciated the initiative
1. The need for standardizing evaluation of scholarly journals in Ethiopia

• It is timely and commendable

    However,

• There should be capacity building component so that needy journals could thrive
  – Resources
  – Trainings
  – Website and Manuscript management system
  – Support in indexing, obtaining doi etc...

• Better integrated with other initiatives like EJOL platform
2. Major criteria to evaluate scholarly journals

• JU team accepted most of the suggested criteria as they are, but questioned;

• **Criterion No 1**: Scholarly quality of research articles
  – The description is vague
  – Evaluating published articles on journals does not seem feasible
    • Who will do the evaluation?
    • **Relevance of articles for national interest** is difficult to measure
    • JU team rather suggests the evaluation should focus on the process (criterion # 3) and the impact of published articles
  – Even if considered, the score given to it is too high
2. Major criteria...

- **Criterion No 3**: *Competency of reviewers and critical rigor of the review process*
  - *We strongly supported this*
    - *but*
  - One of the indicator is “double-blind review process”.
    - *why do we emphasize on this as it is outdated internationally*

- **Criterion No 7**: *Timeliness and continuity*
  - As continuity is a prerequisite, no need of putting it as of the criteria again
2. Major criteria...

• JU team suggested “citation to journal articles” should be added in to the evaluation criteria

• Resource allocation (fulltime staff, budget and office) by hosting institution should be added as indicator somewhere

• Proportion of the internal and external assessment (40:60)
  – We felt 40% for the self assessment is too much taking the pass score 50%
  – Rather, we suggest 30:70

• Naming of Journal ranking;
  – We suggest to use A, B, C... instead of Excellent, V. good....
3. Institution to be made responsible for evaluating scholarly journals

- From suggested options on which body shall do the assessment process and to whom shall be reported?
  - we support EAS to do the evaluation process
4. Institution to be made responsible for accrediting scholarly journals

• National Research Council/ MoST
• ??? HERQA/ME
Other comments

• **The document**
  – Should contain minimum requirements to launch a new journal
  – Should indicate tentative date for the revision of the guideline

• **Queries**
  – The implication of Journals ranking on academic promotion policy of Institutions?
  – The relation of this journals ranking with institutional promotion policy?
  – The driving force that encourage authors to contribute to top ranking journals as per the proposed guidelines?
  – The report indicates that the international minimum standard on the number of articles is 20 per volume.
    • How practical is it? (is it not discipline based?)
1. Corrections to data related to Ethiopian Journal of Social Sciences and Language Studies
   - The information provided on the webpage, the name written does not match with the actual name of the journal. It is written as the journal name of Addis Ababa University (AAU EJSH)
     • The correct name should be as EJSSLS.

2. EJHS
   - Mismatch "Guidelines to author on EJHS website and AJOL"
     • The information was corrected on the revised version of the AJOL website.
   - Table 14: what is reported there is accepted manuscripts and acceptance rat not rejected manuscripts and rejection rate
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