

**UNIVERSITY OF BUSINESS AND INTEGRATED
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**



PUBLICATION OUTLETS POLICY

AN ADDENDUM TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL OF THE UNIVERSITY

DECEMBER 2025

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. FEATURES OF CREDIBLE PUBLICATION OUTLETS.....	2
3. FEATURES OF PREDATORY OUTLETS OR VANITY PRESS	2
4. RECOMMENDED PUBLICATION OUTLETS AND DATABASES	4
4.1. Publishers	5
5. FEATURES OF CREDIBLE BOOKS AND BOOK CHAPTERS.....	5
5.1 Books.....	5
5.2 Textbooks	6
6. RESPONSIBILITIES OF STAKEHOLDERS IN VERIFYING PUBLICATION.....	6
OUTLETS FOR PROMOTION PURPOSES.....	6
7. AMENDMENTS	8
8. REFERENCES.....	8
APPENDIX	9
Publication Outlets Form.....	9

1. INTRODUCTION

This policy document complements quality requirements on publications as stated in Appendix 1 on page 71 of the UBIDS Administrative Manual (2023) as follows: *“Taking into consideration GTEC’s appointments and promotion requirements, published papers should be in a recognised, credible, indexed, and certified journal (local and external), refereed proceedings, books, or any other relevant databases that are accepted and reviewed from time to time.”* These requirements fall short of indicating publication outlets of wide acceptability within the academic community. Hence, the document aims to indicate recognised and credible publication outlets for academics of diverse disciplinary backgrounds in UBIDS in line with standard practice. In reviewing publication outlets, various databases and the criteria for promotion of senior members in public universities in Ghana and beyond were examined to serve as a guide. It should be noted that since it is impracticable to produce a comprehensive list of all credible and recognised publication outlets, what should substantially guide assessors and applicants in determining the credibility of publication outlets is a conscientious attempt to avoid journals, databases, and publishers that operate under questionable overt and covert practices. Consequently, this document highlights the features of credible and predatory outlets and recommends databases, outlets, and publishers that should be considered by UBIDS staff and students in their publication drive. In submitting papers for promotion purposes, applicants should be guided by the Plagiarism Policy of the University as a relevant quality check, as well as the markers of credible and predatory publication outlets presented hereafter.

2. FEATURES OF CREDIBLE PUBLICATION OUTLETS

Credible and recognised publication outlets possess certain qualities to ensure the reliability and trustworthiness of the knowledge they disseminate.

- i. They are indexed and have journal-quality metrics relevant to their respective disciplines. Being indexed in reputable databases and abstracting services (such as AJOL, PubMed, Scopus, Scimago, Web of Science, and others) adds to the credibility of a publication outlet.
- ii. They have qualified editorial board members. A reputable publication outlet will have an editorial board, which comprises experts in the relevant field.
- iii. Evidence of a clear peer review mechanism is available. A credible outlet often uses a rigorous peer review process, whereby experts in the field evaluate the quality and validity of submitted articles before publication.
- iv. Credible outlets maintain consistent quality, ensuring that articles meet high standards in terms of research methodology, theory, writing, and overall content.
- v. Credible outlets have transparent publication policies, including guidelines on authorship, the review process, intellectual property rights and ethical considerations, and adhere to established industry standards.
- vi. Credible outlets are not fast-paced in turnaround time (less than 4 weeks).
- vii. Credible outlets have address systems, which can easily be located.
- viii. High-quality outlets are often associated with a strong reputation in the academic or professional community. They may also have a high impact factor, indicating the frequency with which their articles are cited.

3. FEATURES OF PREDATORY OUTLETS OR VANITY PRESS

Predatory publication outlets are entities that exploit the academic publishing process for financial gain and other motives, often at the expense of scholarly rigour and ethical standards. Identifying predatory journals is crucial to maintaining the integrity of scientific communication.

- i. Predatory outlets may choose names that mimic well-established and reputable outlets to

confuse researchers. A scrutiny of the journal's title and scope is necessary.

- ii. They have no clear peer review process in place and often claim to have a peer-review process, but it is typically superficial or non-existent. Legitimate outlets ensure a thorough and unbiased peer review to maintain quality.
- iii. They seem to have no fixed or easily identifiable address system. Predatory outlets may provide unreliable or non-existent contact information. The contact addresses of the editorial members are usually non-existent. These individuals may not have any real involvement in the outlet's activities.
- iv. Predatory outlets often spam researchers with unsolicited emails, inviting them to submit articles, join editorial boards, or attend conferences. Credible outlets rely on more targeted and respectful communication.
- v. Some have cloned databases and/or deceptive article quality metrics. Predatory outlets claim to have a high impact factor or indexing in well-known databases, but these claims are often false. It is essential to verify such information independently.
- vi. They have unusually very attractive Article Processing Charges (APC) for quick turn-around publishing (usually less than 4 weeks).
- vii. They are not indexed and have no Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs).
- viii. Many such journals are found in Beal's List of Predatory Journals.
- ix. They have no clear policy on archiving (for example, LOCKSS).
- x. They have no verified International Standard Book Number (ISBN).
- xi. They lack clear ethics policies.

In addition to these features, the following tools can be used to avoid predatory outlets, publishers and conferences as noted by credible sources such as the Aalborg University (AAU) researchers:

- Cabell's Predatory Reports (<https://cabells.com/solutions/predatory-reports>)
- Think-Check-Submit for Journals (<https://thinkchecksubmit.org/journals/>)
- Think-Check-Submit for Books and Chapters (<https://thinkchecksubmit.org/books-and-chapters/>)
- Think-Check-Attend for Conferences (<https://thinkcheckattend.org/conference-checker/>)

4. RECOMMENDED PUBLICATION OUTLETS AND DATABASES

In the interest of best practice and high standards in scholarly publications for institutional visibility, the University supports publications by staff and students in credible and recognised indexed outlets. Staff and students must ensure they publish in any of these rankings, databases, or outlets. Staff must have a well-drawn-up publication strategy before deciding on the most suitable outlet for publication. They should be ready to demonstrate, if the need arises, how the work being submitted for promotion meets the stipulated requirements (for example, evidence of peer review report/comments). Please note that at **least 50%** of the publications required for promotion to any rank must be Scopus-indexed outlets.

Credible databases, outlets, and rankings acceptable for publications include the following:

- African Journals Online [AJOL] (<https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ajol>)
- Arts and Humanities Citation Index (<https://clarivate.com/products/scientific-and-academic-research/research-discovery-and-workflow-solutions/webofscience-platform/web-of-science-core-collection/arts-humanities-citation-index/>)
- Association of Business Schools [ABS] ranking
- Association of Computing Machinery [ACM] (<https://www.acm.org>)
- Australian Business Deans Council [ABDC] ranking (<https://abdc.edu.au/abdc-journal-quality-list/>)
- BioMed Central (<https://www.biomedcentral.com>)
- CWTS Journal Indicators (<https://www.journalindicators.com/indicators>)
- Directorate of Open Access Journals [DOAJ] (<https://doaj.org>)
- EBSCO Host (<https://www.ebsco.com/products/research-databases>)
- Journal Storage [JSTOR] (<https://www.jstor.org>)
- MEDLINE (https://www.nlm.nih.gov/medline/medline_overview.html)
- ProQuest (<https://www.proquest.com>)
- PubMed (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>)
- Science Direct (<https://www.sciencedirect.com>)
- Scimago (<https://www.scimagojr.com/>)
- Scopus (<https://www.scopus.com/sources.uri>)
- Social Sciences Citation Index (<https://clarivate.com/products/scientific-and-academic->

research/research-discovery-and-workflow-solutions/webofscience-platform/web-of-science-core-collection/social-sciences-citation-index/)

- Web of Science (<https://mjl.clarivate.com/home>)
- Credible Institutional Journals (local and foreign)
- Other recognised databases/outlets will be reviewed from time to time.

4.1. Publishers

Alternatively, staff and students may choose any of the following publishers for their journal and book publications. Staff and students should strive towards publishing in any one of the following outlets:

Cambridge University Press, Cengage, Elsevier Journals, Emerald, Hachette Book Group, HarperCollins-McGraw-Hill Education, IEEE, IOP Publishing, John Wiley and Sons, Intellect Publishers, Routledge Publishers, Sage Publishers, Oxford University, Oxford University Press, Palgrave Macmillan Publishers, Pearson Education, Penguin Random House, Springer, Taylor and Francis, Intellect Publishers, Woeli Publishing, and Institutional Publishers, all of which are all indexed publishers.

5. FEATURES OF CREDIBLE BOOKS AND BOOK CHAPTERS

To count towards an applicant's promotion, a book or textbook must have the following elements of quality:

5.1 Books

- i. It should be peer-reviewed, and there must be proof of formal peer review or comments.
- ii. It must be the product of a rigorous assessment by academics or professionals in the field of specialisation.
- iii. It must be research-based, typically intended for communicating the findings to an academic community/a specific discipline.
- iv. Publishers should be (a) recognised by the University, (b) professional bodies [academic or technical] and (c) recognised research centres.
- v. It must be edited by a reputable scholar in the field and published by a recognised publishing house.
- vi. It must be published by a recognised and credible academic publisher (local or external), not a predatory publisher or a publisher on Beal's list of predatory/vanity presses.

- vii. It must have an International Standard Book Number (ISBN), a unique 13-digit code that identifies books and book-like products.

5.2 Textbooks

- i. They are comprehensive compilations of content on a particular subject.
- ii. They are normally used as manuals for instruction.
- iii. They should be peer-reviewed, and there must be proof of formal peer review or comments.
- iv. Their target audiences are students and educators.
- v. They are edited by an expert in the field and published by a recognised publishing house.
- vi. They should have ISBNs and be published by recognised and credible academic publishers.

6. RESPONSIBILITIES OF STAKEHOLDERS IN VERIFYING PUBLICATION OUTLETS FOR PROMOTION PURPOSES

This addendum to the Administrative Manual (2023) regarding publications must, at all times, accompany promotion documents sent out to Internal and External Assessors.

- i. It shall be the primary responsibility of applicants to read the Administrative Manual and the Statutes of the University and to adhere to core principles and requirements contained therein before submitting publications for promotion to their Heads of Department for consideration.
- ii. On submitting published materials (for example, articles, book chapters, edited books, or books) for consideration for promotion, applicants must indicate which of the University-recognised outlets/databases the materials are published in or indexed. For the avoidance of doubt, the database/outlet in which material is published or the publisher of that material can be any of those specified in this document. The applicant must identify at least one of the databases or publishers listed in the Appendix.
- iii. Heads of Departments, in assessing promotion documents, must validate the databases/outlets in which published materials are found, in addition to other related issues, which qualify the publications to be sent to the Faculty/School Appointments and Promotion Committee (A&P).
- iv. It shall be the responsibility of the Faculty/School A&P to verify the credibility of the

publication outlets and other related issues in line with standards contained herein, in addition to other requirements, before applicants' publications are moved to the next level for processing.

- v. It shall be the responsibility of the University A&P to conduct thorough checks on the appraisal done by lower-level authorities concerning publication outlets and other related issues, guided by the Administrative Manual and the Statutes of the University.
- vi. The attention of all assessors (internal and external) should be drawn to the requirements relating to publication outlets in the Administrative Manual and be guided by them when assessing publications. All stakeholders need to exhibit due diligence in verifying publication outlets (refer to the list of publication outlets tendered by applicants) to avoid issues of conflict and/or conflict of interest, which could dent the reputation of applicants, and/or the A&P Committees, and the image of the University as a whole.
- vii. Staff who may have received research funding/grants from the University for which a research output is required must do so in either of the University-recognised outlets/databases.
- viii. When in doubt, the Directorate of Research (DoR) or the University Library should be consulted for assistance by those responsible for the eligibility or otherwise of published material for promotion.
- ix. The Human Resource Directorate of the university should make the Publication Outlets Form (Appendix) available to all applicants, in addition to the curriculum vitae template and approved form used for promotion in UBIDS.

It shall be the responsibility of the DoR to continuously encourage senior members to publish their research work in credible and recognised publication outlets by consulting this document, the Administrative Manual, Plagiarism Policy of the University, as well as alerting senior members to predatory publishers/journals on its website. Also, the DoR should update senior members on new practices in the academic publishing landscape to enable them to make informed evaluations of publication outlets in their working relationships with them. To this end, there is a need for the DoR to conduct periodic audits

of publication outlets and advise the Academic Board regarding expected standards and best practices of such outlets for further action.

7. AMENDMENTS

All acceptable publication outlets are to be reviewed from time to time. The DoR and the University Library, with the support of an Academic Board Committee, shall review the outlets every year and submit a report to the Academic Board for consideration.

8. REFERENCES

1. GIMPA (2022). Guidelines for Promotion of Senior Members.
2. Publication Strategy and Checklist of Aalborg University, Denmark, found on the AAU Library website.
3. KNUST (2019). Criteria for Appointments and Promotions of Senior Members.
4. UBIDS (2022). Plagiarism Policy.
5. UBIDS (2022). Administrative Manual.
6. UBIDS (2023). Statutes.
7. UCC (2021). Criteria for Appointments and Promotions of Senior Members (Revised).
8. UDS (2009). Criteria for Appointments and Promotions of Senior Members.

APPENDIX

Publication Outlets Form

This form must be completed by all applicants and placed before the publications submitted for consideration for promotion.

No	Provide complete reference of publication	Type of publication (Book, Refereed Conference Proceeding, Book Chapter, Journal article)	Database, outlet, ranking or Publisher (mention either of them as contained in University's list of outlets)	Validation by HoD/Internal Assessor(s) (+ / -)	Validation by Faculty/School A&P (+ / -)
1.	Yakubu, D. (2023). Modeling perceived information technology (IT) risk as a third-order latent construct and its effect on satisfaction. <i>Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism</i> , DOI: 10.1080/1528008X.2022.2163045.	Journal article	Scopus, Scimago, Taylor & Francis	+	+
2.	XXX	XXX	IOP Publishing	-	-
3.					
4.					
5.					

Note: + (Positive) indicates valid and – (Negative) indicates not valid