

**Culverhouse Journal List Revision Process and Guidelines**  
**(Culverhouse Research Committee, Jan. 2018)**  
**Approved by FEB: March 21, 2018**  
**Approved by Faculty Forum: April 2, 2018 (68 Approve, 7 Disapprove, 5 Abstain)**

In order to continue to enhance the research productivity of the Culverhouse College of Commerce and increase the transparency with which the college evaluates faculty research productivity, each discipline maintains a journal list that is used to assess faculty research contributions. This document provides policies that govern the processes for revising the journal lists originally created by the Culverhouse College of Commerce in 2016 and classifying articles published in academic journals that are not included on these lists at the time of the articles acceptance. The document has two objectives:

- (1) to provide a standardized process by which each discipline can modify its journal list  
and
- (2) to provide a standardized process by which faculty members can petition for classification of articles published in journals that are not included in any of the college's current journal lists at the time of the article's acceptance.

The policies in this document build on the definitions of the *Aspirational*, *Excellent*, *Good*, and *Solid* journal categories (provided in the Appendix) and the structure of the journal lists developed by the college in 2016.

### **Policy for Revising a Journal List**

The Culverhouse College's journal lists may be revised periodically to reflect changes in the quality and stature of journals and changes in faculty research interests. The policy provides means for the faculty to propose revisions to the college's journal lists in order to reflect these changes.

A faculty member who proposes that

- a journal not currently on one of the college's journal lists be added to a journal list or
- a journal currently on one of the college's journal lists be reclassified

shall file a petition with her or his department chair by January 15. In this petition, the faculty member shall include

- an indication of the ramifications of the proposed change to the journal list (i.e., what journal(s) would be added to the journal list, reclassified, and/or dropped from the journal list as a result of the proposed change)
- a clear explanation of how the proposed change to the journal list supports department/college/university strategy
- a list of the Editor(s), Editorial Review Board members, and their host schools for the journal(s) that would be added to the journal list, reclassified, and/or dropped from the journal list as a result of the proposed change
- information on the ranking on other lists for the journal(s) that would be added to the journal list, reclassified, and/or dropped from the journal list as a result of the proposed change, including:
  - UT-Dallas
  - Financial Times
  - Association of Business Schools
  - Australian Business Deans Council List (ABDC)
  - Two lists from peer or better schools
- impact scores for the journal(s) that would be added to the journal list, reclassified, and/or dropped from the journal list as a result of the proposed change
- acceptance rates for the journal(s) that would be added to the journal list, reclassified, and/or dropped from the journal list as a result of the proposed change
- an indication of the category (Aspirational, Excellent, Good, or Solid) the faculty member proposes for the journal(s) to be added to the journal list and/or reclassified as a result of the proposed change
- justification for these changes (i.e., it should be clear to the research committee that a journal to be added will contribute substantial value over the journal(s) to be reclassified and/or dropped from the journal list).

Such a petition should only be made in instances where it is very likely that Culverhouse faculty members will continue to publish in the proposed journal on a relatively consistent basis.

- If a Department Head/Director receives one or more petitions by the January 15 deadline, the Department Head/Director shall ask the Department Research Committee to review the petition(s) and vote individually on each petition and all resulting changes to the journal list. The Department Research Committee will inform the Department Head/Director of the outcome by February 1. The Department Research Committee shall serve as the arbitrator in the event of conflicts between proposals at the department level.
- If a majority of all members of the Department Research Committee vote to approve the proposed change(s), the tenured/tenure-track faculty within the discipline shall vote on changes to the journal list that result from each proposal individually by February 15. Changes to the journal list that result from each individual proposal require approval by the majority of all tenured/tenure-track faculty within the discipline. The Department Head/Director will be responsible for administering this vote.
- The Department Head/Director will inform the Associate Dean for Research of
  - her or his recommendation on whether to approve the proposed reclassification of the journal
  - and
  - the Department Research Committee's recommendation on whether to approve the proposed reclassification of the journalby February 18.
- The College Research Committee will review the recommendations of the Department Research Committee and Department Head/Director and decide whether to approve the proposed reclassification of the journal by March 1.
- Journals should not be moved to a higher classification in order to accommodate the addition of a new journal to the journal list. Reallocation to a higher classification should instead be considered independent of any other changes to the journal list and done so solely on the

merits of the journal that under consideration for reclassification. For example, if a faculty member proposes reclassifying a journal from the Solid to the Good category and the discipline list already includes the maximum number of journals in the Good category, the issue of the number of journals in the Good category cannot be resolved by simply moving one of the other journals in the Good category to the Excellent category (this change must be presented in an independent proposal).

- The Associate Dean for Research will inform the Dean and the Department Head/Director of changes to journal lists in her or his department on March 1, and the Department Head/Director will immediately notify all tenured and tenure track faculty in the affected discipline.
- Changes to journal lists will be effective on April 1 immediately following the conclusion of this process.
- Each discipline shall review its journal list during the spring semester every three years and propose whether any journals should be
  - added to/removed from the list
  - recategorized
- by January 15. Changes proposed as a result of this review must be approved by a majority of tenured/tenure-track faculty by February 15, the Department Head/Director by February 18, and the College Research Committee by March 1. It is acceptable for a discipline to conclude, following this review, that no changes are necessary.
- If a draft of an article is under review with a journal at the time the journal is reclassified, the article will be assigned the higher of these two categories if the review process results in publication of the article in question by the reclassified journal.

Under this process, the Aspirational category will rarely change, the Excellent category will change somewhat more frequently than the Aspirational category, the Good category will change somewhat more frequently than the Excellent category, and the Solid category will change somewhat more frequently than the Good category.

The College Research Committee will review and consider revisions to this process every five years or when circumstances dictate a need to do so.

### **Policy for Consideration of High-Quality Publications in Journals not included on Culverhouse Journal Lists**

Culverhouse faculty also publish research in journals not included on the Culverhouse College's journal lists. This policy provides the means for recognizing such research when it is published in a high quality journal that *is not included* on the Culverhouse College's journal lists.

If a faculty member publishes an article in a journal not included on the college's lists and the likelihood of publishing additional articles in that journal is very low, it is unnecessary to formally add the journal to a journal list. In such cases, the faculty member may petition the Department Research Committee for the article to have merit equivalent to article published in journals at the Aspirational, Excellent, Good, or Solid level. In those instances, the journal in which this article has been published will not be permanently added to the list; however, depending on the outcome of the petitioning process, the article may be considered as published in an Aspirational, Excellent, Good, or Solid journal for consideration in decisions on academic qualifications, promotion, tenure, and merit.

A faculty member who proposes the classification of an article published in a journal not on the college's lists shall file a petition with her or his department chair by January 15 and no more than one year after the article in question was accepted for publication.<sup>1</sup> In this petition, the faculty member shall include

- an indication of the proposed classification (Aspirational, Excellent, Good, or Solid) of the article
- a clear statement regarding how the article supports the department/college/university strategy
- a list of the Editor(s), Editorial Review Board, and their host schools for the journal in which the article has been accepted/published

---

<sup>1</sup> During the implementation period of this policy, petitions will be considered for publications accepted on or after April 1, 2015.

- information on the ranking of journal in which the article has been accepted/published in other lists
- impact score for the journal in which the article has been accepted/published
- acceptance rate for the journal in which the article has been accepted/published
- justification for the proposed classification of the article (this can include, but is not limited to, information on the number and quality of citations of the article in question)
- If a department chair receives one or more petitions by the January 15 deadline, the Department Head/Director shall ask the Department Research Committee to review the petition(s) and vote on a recommended classification for the journal in which the article has been accepted/published by February 1. The Department Research Committee shall serve as the arbitrator in the event of conflicts between proposals at the department level.
- Based on a committee vote, the members of the Department Research Committee will make a recommendation on whether to approve the proposed classification of the journal in which the article has been accepted/published to the Department Head/Director by February 15.
- The Department Head/Director will inform the Associate Dean for Research of
  - her or his recommendation on whether to approve the proposed classification of the article
 and
  - the Department Research Committee's recommendation on whether to approve the proposed classification of the article
 by February 18.
- The College Research Committee will review the recommendations of the Department Research Committee and Department Head/Director and decide whether to approve the proposed classification of the article by March 1.

All such petitions to the department head will be retained in a central database to be maintained by the Associate Dean for Research to allow for consistency in these decisions. Prior to consideration of any such petitions, the Department Head/Director should consult with the

Associate Dean for Research to determine whether the journal in which the article has been accepted/published has been considered in the past.

Faculty members may appeal the College Research Committee's decision to the Associate Dean for Research within two weeks of the College Research Committees' decision. Appeals must be submitted electronically to the Associate Dean for Research and must include the information outlined above as well a statement explaining the justification for appealing the department College Research Committee's decision. The Associate Dean for Research will make the final decision on such appeals.

The College Research Committee will review and consider revisions to this process every five years or when circumstances dictate a need to do so.

## Appendix – Definitions of Journal Classifications

***Aspirational journals (5 per discipline)*** represent journals that few at top schools would question as being ‘premier’ journals. In other words, these journals are at the top of major journal lists (i.e., UT-Dallas, Financial Times 45, Australian Dean’s). Aspirational publications increase the visibility of the college’s research; however, expected publication rates in aspirational journals are expected to be low.

***Excellent journals (10 per discipline)*** represent journals that most scholars accept as representing very high quality research with strong impact. Sometimes these are called “A-journals”. These journals typically have high impact scores or are highly respected for publishing a specific kind of research, but there is some debate over whether they can be fairly put in the same category as the Aspirational journals. Some of the top/elite schools and all of the large state research-oriented schools reward their faculty for publishing in these journals.

***Good journals (15 per discipline)*** are recognized for publishing high-quality research with strong impact, but perhaps not with as much consistency as the Excellent and Aspirational journals. Some articles are noticed and have impact, others less so. Elite schools do not reward their faculty for publishing in these journals, but most large state research-oriented schools do.

***Solid journals (15 per discipline)*** publish competently executed research that has smaller impact. Research from these journals is not read and cited as often as the preceding categories. Large state research-oriented state schools do not reward, or offer only small rewards, for publishing in these journals.

***Unusual journals*** have recognized merit as publication outlets, but serve purposes that fall outside the traditional peer-reviewed research journal’s objectives and processes. Often, these journals publish invited papers by well-known authors, or go through some other non-traditional editorial or quasi-blind review process. An example is *Harvard Business Review*, which is perhaps the most impactful practitioner journal. However, it is not blind reviewed and thus should not be considered Aspirational.

***Unlisted journals*** include all remaining journals. Unlisted journals are listed in Cabell’s, but are not widely distributed, read, or cited. They have average or below-average 5-year impact scores and acceptance rates that typically exceed 20 percent when they are not manipulated. Their



editors are not widely known and rarely are found at elite or large state research institutions. These journals are only on the broadest journal lists and never in the top categories, although they might be in the second category in very broadly defined lists (e.g. Cabell's and Australian Dean's list).