



University of Zimbabwe Library

Journal Evaluation Rubric

The journal evaluation rubric presented in the table below provides useful information to be considered when assessing the credibility of a journal or publisher. Apply the evaluation criteria before submitting your manuscript for publication.

Criterion	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Step 1. Journal evaluation			
Web search for the journal	The journal is within the top 5 entries on the first page of search results and there are no scam alert postings.	The journal is on the first page of search results but not within the top 5 entries and there are no scam alert postings.	The journal is not on the first page of search results or there is at least one scam alert post about the journal.
Journal title	The journal name cannot be confused with another journal.	The journal being evaluated has a name similar to another journal but is able to be distinguished between the two.	The journal being evaluated is unable to be distinguished from another with a similar name.
Editorial board	The editorial board is listed with their full names and institutional affiliation.	The editorial board is listed with their full names only (no affiliation).	There is no editorial board listed.
Review process	The journal states whether it is peer reviewed/edited and has a review policy listed.	The journal states whether it is peer reviewed/edited and has no review policy listed.	The journal does not state whether it is peer reviewed/edited and has no review policy listed.
Conflicts of interest	The journal thoroughly and clearly states a conflicts of interest policy, including how it will handle potential conflicts of interest of editors, authors, and reviewers.	The journal states a conflicts of interest policy, but the description of how conflicts will be handled is unclear.	The journal does not state a conflicts of interest policy.
Journal	The journal website is	The journal website is	The website is poorly

website	competently designed and functional. (examples: no broken links, easy navigation, no missing Information.	adequately designed with passable functionality. (examples: adequate navigation, few broken links, some missing information)	designed and is not functional. (examples: broken links, poor navigation, missing information, spelling and grammatical errors)
Business model	The journal clearly states its business model. This includes any revenue sources, like author fees, subscriptions, advertising, reprints, institutional support, and organizational support.	The journal's business model lacks clarity when stating its revenue sources, like author fees, subscriptions, advertising, reprints, institutional support, and organizational support.	The journal does not state its business model.
Journal archive	The journal website contains an archive of its past issues with links to full text articles.	The journal website contains an archive but it may be incomplete or does not contain links to full text articles.	The journal does not have an archive of its past issues.
Publishing schedule	The journal clearly states how often its issues will be published each year and this agrees with the archive.	The journal does not state how often its issues will be published but it can be determined from the archive.	The journal does not state how often its issues will be published each year and it cannot be determined from the archive.
Author fees	The journal clearly states the amount of money an author will pay to have each article published.	The journal states that an author fee is required but does not note how much it is.	The journal does not state whether or not there are any author fees.
Copyright information	The journal clearly describes its copyright and licensing information on the journal's Web site, and licensing terms are indicated on the published articles (HTML/PDF).	The journal does not clearly describe its copyright and licencing information.	Copyright and licensing information is not found on the journal's Web site and on any published articles.
Criterion	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)

Journal indexed in accredited platforms	The journal is indexed in more than one subject database. examples: ERIC, Google Scholar, Web of Science, PsycINFO), DOAJ	The journal is indexed in one subject database. (example: ERIC)	The journal is not indexed in a subject database.
Step 2. Publisher evaluation			
Web search for the publisher	The publisher is within the top 5 entries on the first page of search results and there are no scam alert postings.	The publisher is on the first page of search results but not within the top 5 entries and there are no scam alert postings.	The publisher is not on the first page of search results or there is at least one scam alert posting.
Publisher information	Information about the ownership/management of the journal and contact information about the publisher is clearly identified.	Information about the ownership/management of the journal or contact information about the publisher is clearly identified.	Information about the ownership/management of the journal and contact information about the publisher is not available.

(Adapted from Rele, Kennedy and Blass, 2017)

If the steps demonstrated above are not clear, contact the Library on email: library@uzlib.uz.ac.zw